

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
APRIL 1890.

ARTICLE I.

THE REFLEX INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

By REV. J. A. SINGMASTER, A. M., Brooklyn, N. Y.

The grounds and justification of Foreign Missions do not lie in their Reflex Influence. Even their chief inspiration does not arise thence; but surely there are elements of vindication, conviction and encouragement in it.

The work of missions, regardless of its authority, is amenable to the universal law of action and reaction. The question that arises in the minds of the doubting is whether the reaction is healthy or not, in other words whether foreign missions pay. A multitude of indisputable facts may be adduced to give an affirmative answer. These facts can not well be stated too frequently. They effectually silence the opposer, convince the doubter and confirm the believer. They are calculated to kindle the zeal of all to whom the great commission has come.

1. We note as the first reflex influence of missions that *commerce has reaped rich results.*

Missionaries have usually, though not invariably, preceded merchants on heathen soil. But everywhere they have been the friends of legitimate trade as being mutually advantageous to all concerned. They have thus assisted in opening new territory. They have inculcated industry, frugality and honesty

among the natives. By the larger needs awakened by the preaching of the Gospel, they have stimulated business to a wonderful degree.

It is, of course, impossible to estimate how much in the aggregate commerce owes to missions, but it is fair to presume that the following illustration is not an exceptional one. From little or no trade between the United States and the Sandwich Islands a half century ago the volume of commerce now amounts to millions per annum. As long ago as 1870 it reached the sum of \$4,400,426, while it is estimated that the total contributions of all denominations in this country for the entire foreign field during the same year were only \$1,633,801. Dr. Anderson states the case still more strikingly when he says that our *profits* on the same commerce for the year 1871 amounted to \$660,964 while the entire expenditure *during the fifty years* of missionary labor in these islands was only \$1,220,000!

2. *Science has been promoted.*

Missionaries as a class are educated men and women. Many of them have been and are eminent for their gifts and their attainments. While they preach, they also teach and study. They have translated many scientific works into foreign languages, have everywhere established schools, ranging in many places from the primary to the collegiate grades. They have directly by their own investigations made large contributions to positive science. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin is quoted by the Providence *Journal* as saying: Hundreds of educated men have given accounts of observations in many lands, describing countries, climates, modes of travel, nations and races, their physical, mental and moral characteristics, their social condition and habits, their religion, education and government, their industries and modes of subsistence involving large contributions to knowledge.

There is scarcely a department of science that has not been enriched by missionaries. History has received the benefit of their exploits among buried cities of the past and by their interpretations of the inscriptions on their tombs and monuments, as well as from their accounts of living races and tribes. Archaeology has received many contributions from their discoveries. Etymology has profited by their observation. Philology, es-

pecially, has been promoted by their increasing study of language. Natural history, geology, botany, conchology, indeed all branches of natural science, have received an impetus by their studies and from the specimens collected. The science of comparative religions would be barren without their aid. "Carl Ritter, 'the prince of geographers,' confesses that he could not have written his *Erd-Kunde* without the aid of the material collected and transmitted by missionaries."

3. *The Christian conscience is thus satisfied.*

Could it be demonstrated that Canon Taylor's false assertions are true, that missions are stupendous failures, they would nevertheless not have failed in giving deep and lasting satisfaction to those who have joined in making the offers of the Gospel to the heathen.

Had the Saviour given the Church no express command to evangelize the world, it seems scarcely conceivable that enlightened, warm-hearted Christian people could be at peace with themselves as long as their fellows were groping in darkness, if they did not at least try to lead them to the light. The responsibility of the Church ceases with the deliverance of the message, but that must be done with all fidelity. Though Noah could not boast of many converts for his one hundred and twenty years of preaching, he could at least enter his ark with a quiet conscience.

The satisfaction of right doing, of responding to the appeal of helplessness, is a sufficient reward for the trouble. Methinks that an unanswered Macedonian cry would be enough to mock the peace of any Christian. Every precept of his holy religion would confront him for his neglect. The Golden Rule would become a standing reproof. The mingled cries of famishing multitudes, of degraded womanhood, of suffering childhood, of helpless, hopeless humanity without God, would never die in his ear until the voice of a hardened conscience itself would be hushed.

4. *Scepticism receives a telling answer.*

Missions are a standing evidence of the inspiration of the Bible. Destroy all other proofs of its divine authorship save the effect of the Gospel on the degraded African, South-sea islander

or the Fugean and you will need no more convincing argument. It made even the infidel Darwin pause, when he beheld the miracles of transformation wrought by missionary instrumentalities. As long as the Church can point to new trophies of the cross and to an ever widening circle of light she need not fear the skeptic. Undeniable facts will ever outweigh empty bable. It is certainly beyond dispute that the Bible goes hand in hand everywhere with freedom, happiness and prosperity.

Missions are the grandest vindication of the devotion and heroism of the Church. The unbeliever may sneeringly point his finger at the Christian and tell him that he belongs to the Church for social or business reasons, but when he sees the disciple give of his substance without hope of return or even give himself, his sons and daughters to labor in hostile climes among abandoned heathen, he is silent,

Now-a-days our moral, but irreligious scientists are trying to satisfy their souls with philanthropy. Their creed is, trying to live right and to do good, strange to say, after the model of Jesus—uncrowned and dethroned! What exquisite irony! But where else will you look for such philanthropy as missions reveal? Show me the hospitals, orphanages and schools which infidelity or paganism has dedicated to the use of the unfortunate. There are none to my knowledge or if there be, they are probably weak imitations of what the Church is doing everywhere.

5. *Broader views of truth are obtained.*

Missions have a wonderful power in opening one's eyes. They are not simply a confirmation of the Bible, but an explanation and illustration of it. We want to read the Scriptures to-day with the addition of the acts of the apostles down in Africa and over in China and up in Greenland. It is surprising in the light of revealed truth that there ever was a Christian man to oppose missions; that men could look up to heaven and call God father and then to forget to call their fellow, brother, even though he happened to live across the sea.

The Bible is certainly the great hand-book of missions. It contains the record of God's mission to a ruined world and of the divine plan of its promulgation. From it, illuminated by the

Holy Spirit, we catch the inspiration, learn the purpose and the method of evangelization.

The Old Testament tells of human wandering and degradation and then of hope by God's grace. A large portion of it is taken up by the record of God's preparation of salvation for the race through the Israelite, with here and there prophetic glimpses, through rifts in the cloud of Jewish environment, of that brighter and larger church of the future. The gospels tell us of the advent of the Son and the completion of the promised salvation, closing with the sublime command to spread the glad tidings to the ends of the earth. The Acts of the Apostles is practically a missionary diary of the experiences which befell those who obeyed the command. The Epistles for the most part are letters to mission churches. The book of Revelation unfolds the vision of the unnumbered multitudes before the throne, of every nation and kindred and tribe, and rings once more with the clarion tones of the Spirit and the Bride uttering the *whosoever* to sin-burdened humanity!

Blot out the missionary idea and you lose the key to the Bible. Its grand unity is broken into unrelated fragments and the vastness of its plan is lost in the narrowness of a misconception. Let a Christian read the Bible only with a view to help himself or as it applies to his immediate surroundings, and you will have a man to whom the Scriptures must be in large measure a mystery or at best a mere aggregation of verses and chapters.

The missionary idea alone widens our conception of the scope of the kingdom of God on earth. Ideas precede actions—men are slow to go blindly in religious matters involving sacrifice. So a century ago, before the missionary idea obtained, the home church had very contracted notions about the extent of the kingdom. At all events so impractical was the suggestion of foreign mission work to the great body of the churches that it was frowned upon by learned and devoted men. But now that our vision has been enlarged by the achievements of modern missions, we rise to somewhat of a view of the vastness and grandeur of the kingdom of Christ—embracing all lands and outlasting all time.

So too it may be said that the missionary idea emphasizes

and realizes the brotherhood of man. Before its divine light fade all our prejudices of race and nationality. In it we see the truth that God hath made of one blood all nations and that he hath redeemed them all with the blood of his dear Son.

6. *The development of Christian virtues and graces.*

If the cause of foreign missions reacted in no other way than in promoting the fruits of the Spirit, the church at home would be amply compensated.

Missionary work is peculiarly a work of faith and its prosecution is both the evidence and strengthening of that faith. How utterly presumptuous would it be for a handful of defenceless men and women to seek out and settle among savages sunken in apparently hopeless degradation without faith in the promises and help of God. How wicked it would be for the Church to send its sheep among wolves without some assurance of success! But see how grandly God has honored and multiplied the faith of those who honored him in obeying his commandments.

Notice, further, how missions develop the grace of giving. They are among the truest tests of pure benevolence, for they appeal to the most generous and disinterested motives of the Christian heart. The man who rejoices to be able to further the kingdom abroad must be a man of open heart and purse—one who may be relied upon to aid every good cause at home.

Then again we are reminded how the spirit of missions begets the spirit of self-denial and sacrifice—those Christly virtues exhibited by the saints of all the ages who give of their little, yea, who give themselves for the good of others.

7. *The promotion of Christian unity.*

When the thought of the church is turned to active work for Christ there is ordinarily little time or disposition for complaint and disagreement. Let there be a live missionary interest and you will find a spirit of unity. We believe that the most powerful bond of union in the Congregational Church with its comparatively lax polity is the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, with the record of its magnificent achievements under God.

Not only does the missionary spirit unite the churches of the same name more closely, but it erases all merely superficial denomina-

national distinctions, as illustrated in the founding of the London Missionary Society in the year 1795 in the chapel of Lady Huntington "when venerable gray-headed ministers of the English Church and Dissenters fell weeping into each other's arms." What a splendid illustration of the same fact is seen in that unparalleled world's Missionary Convention held in London last June, where gathered men and women of every name and sect from every quarter of the globe to consider problems of evangelization.

If you go to the foreign field itself, you will find that the great needs and dangers incident to the work have a tendency to make missionaries of diffent names forget many of the points of controversy at home. The movement toward a national church in Japan is a significant illustration. We, therefore, hail these Providential indications that Christ's own prayer for unity is being answered almost in proportion as the Church is keeping the great commission.

8. The development of grand inspiring characters.

Not the least of the blessed reflex influences is the legacy of heroism bequeathed to the Church by missionaries and their converts. From the great apostle to the Gentiles, whose ministry was one long period of suffering ending in triumphant martyrdom, down to this day nothing else so inspires and thrills the Church as the record of the lives of the noble men and women who have suffered for the testimony of Jesus. There is something that rebukes the indifferent and kindles the enthusiast in the very thought of our dear friends away off amid the loneliness of heathen darkness! And how those noble men tower up who stood at their post in spite of surging opposition and apparent hopelessness until God crowned their faith and labors with fruit and surrounded their names with a fadeless halo!

"Theodore Parker rose from the reading of the life of Judson to declare that if missions had produced but one such hero, all cost were repaid."

And what shall we say of David Brainerd and Henry Martyn and Bishop Heber and David Livingstone and Schwartz and Ziegenballd and all the mighty men of valor of whom the world

was not worthy? Only the other day intelligence was received of the death of the Catholic Father Damien among the lepers of the Sandwich Islands whither he had gone some years before with the certain expectation of an awful, lingering death before him for his devotion to Christ and an abandoned people whose bodies were not half so vile as their souls.

From among the heathen themselves the Church has received a recompense in the record of unexcelled nobility of character. A few years ago Foo Chow, a Chinese convert, allowed himself to be sold into bondage that he might preach Christ to the slaves. Literally thousands of natives in Madagascar have died for Christ in the last quarter of a century.

9. *The direct help received by the Church for its home work.*

There are to-day in Christian lands devoted and able pastors who have come from heathen lands and have felt a providential call to labor where they do. There are young men in this country who, coming hither for knowledge or gain, have found Christ and who labor for him now.*

If history shall repeat itself, it is possible that the time may come when our present mission-fields will have to send laborers to the home churches, just as we now send them to the birth-place of the Founder of Christianity.

In the great problem of the evangelization of our large cities, in which are ever-growing and almost inaccessible colonies of foreigners living in darkness and even idolatry, it may become necessary to appeal for help to their own converted countrymen at home to come over and help us.

10. *The multiplication of home enterprises.*

The fear that giving to the cause of foreign missions will deplete the home treasury and paralyze local enterprise is born of unbelief and is in direct opposition both to the divine promise and to the facts in the case. So convinced am I of this that I

*A remarkable illustration has recently come to the knowledge of the writer where the missionary spirit of a lady received an unexpected and invaluable recompense. A Christian Chinese girl was sent to this country to be educated. At school she met the daughter of a lady devoted to missions and became the instrument of her conversion to Christ to the inexpressible joy of her mother.

am sure however great the local needs and poverty may be no congregation can afford to lose the blessing which comes from participation in foreign work. It is not a mere coincidence but rather a consequence that the establishment of the American Board was succeeded by the founding of such great institutions as the American Sunday School Union, the Tract Society, the American Bible Society, the Seamen's Friend Society and the Home Missionary Society.

11. The numerical growth of the Home Church.

There can be no real growth where there is no life and hence where there is no missionary spirit, which is the evidence of life, there will be no real healthy and steady numerical growth in a church. In that classic illustration of primitive faith and method in the work of Harms at Hermannsburg this truth stands out prominently. Ten thousand members were added to the home church during the last seventeen years of the noble pastor's life.

Seventy years ago two branches of the Baptist Church in this country were of about equal strength. The one opposed missions, while the other caught the spirit of the age. And what is the result? The former numbers to-day 45,000 communicants; the latter 2,500,000.

In this missionary half century now closing the American churches have increased on the whole in greater ratio than the population.

12. The quickening of the inner life of the churches.

Any influence which will accomplish this must be from God and should hence be fostered with the greatest care.

"The missionary spirit is the normal development of the Christian life" says Seelye. "When the church ceases to be evangelistic, she ceases to be evangelical" says another. When her love and faith grow cold, and she forgets the dying injunction of her Lord and her ears are closed to the cry of heathen despair, then woe to her inner life. But when she is alert to relieve distress in the joy of a new obedience, it is a sign of life and the promise that the windows of heaven shall be opened for descending blessings upon her.

"At the beginning of the last century, and during its first half, the Church of God was almost dead of apathy and inactivity * * * Irreligion, immorality and infidelity, together, seemed closing in upon the body of nominal disciples folding the church in the embrace of a merciless winter. Nothing but the activity of a new missionary era broke the awful charm of this deadly stagnation and congelation. God's clarion peal, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," rang once more in the ears of a slumbering and half-frozen Church. Men woke to see that as Samuel Blair said, "piety at home lay a-dying while pagans abroad were perishing; and it was this arousing to a new activity for the lost, that brought back warmth, restored circulation and quickened all the pulses and currents of spiritual life" (Dr. Pierson).

The era of missions marks the awakening of the dead churches of England and Scotland. In Germany the remarkable mission work of Pastor Harms was coincident with a perpetual revival.

The lessons of our subject are too plain to need elucidation. If God has so honored the feeble faith and the comparatively trifling gifts of his Church, what may we not expect when the whole Church lays all her treasures of wealth, endowment and life upon the altar of consecration?

ARTICLE II.

WALDENSTROM AND HIS TEACHINGS.*

By REV. C. A. EVALD, Chicago, Ill.

During the past years we have had opportunity quite frequently of reading in some American papers about a wonderful free church movement in Sweden. One of the most prominent leaders of this great movement is Rev. Prof. Paul Peter Waldenstrom, Ph. D., D. D., who visited America during the summer and fall months of this year. Dr. W. is professor of theology,

*Address delivered at the meeting of the Martin Luther Society of Chicago at the Sherman House, Dec. 27th, 1889. Printed by request of the Society.

or moral science, and biblical Hebrew and Greek in the College of Gefle in the northern part of Sweden.

He is one of the most remarkable men of our age, being at the same time a learned theologian, a very popular and able preacher, a widely known author, a ready debater, and an eminent statesman and educator. In his writings and public utterances he is witty and humorous, cutting and fearless, and always radical and outspoken. He has many excellent traits of character. He is a model husband and an indulgent father, a great patriot and a shrewd business man. We cannot but deplore that such an otherwise good and noble man would make his own the unsound theological views that he has published and defended with great eloquence and decided ability.

The subject of our sketch was some years ago well characterized by the eminent Englishman, Mr. Reid, the author of the excellent tracts, "Letters about Jesus" and "The blood of Jesus," when he said: "He (Dr. W.) has a good intellect, but a poor faith."

Dr. W. was born in 1838.* In 1864 he was ordained as a clergyman of the Swedish Lutheran State Church. In the same year he became professor of theology, or moral science, at the State College of Umea. In 1862 a call had been extended to him from the Swedish Augustana Synod of North America. The intention was that he should become one of the professors of our theological seminary, then located at Paxton, Illinois. The call was accepted and W. prepared to leave for this country, but his father strongly opposed his going, and he abandoned the plan of coming here. God only knows what the result would have been, had he really come and joined the Augustana Synod, but I am of the opinion that under such circumstances he would have had other aims for his life than trying to undermine the very foundations of a sinner's salvation.

In 1868 W. assumed charge of the "*Pietisten*" (The Pietist), founded by Mr. Rosenius in 1842. This periodical had a wide circulation and a great influence in all parts of Sweden. In his

*In a debate on original sin he said, "I was born in 1838 and could not be a sinner in 1837."

biography of Rosenius W. says: "Rosenius exercised a wonderful influence on the religious movement in our land." This influence is explained by his truly godly character, his edifying writing and sermons.

Until 1872 W. wrote and preached in the same spirit as Mr. Rosenius had done, although it was very plain to all experienced Christians that the new editor of "*Pietisten*" was comparatively as yet inexperienced and immature. Yet nobody seemed to suspect anything serious until W. in the June issue of *Pietisten* 1872 in a sermon on the morning lesson for the 20th Sunday after Trinity, Matt. 13 : 44-46 (First new series of texts) in a most outspoken manner denied the vicarious suffering of Christ. Most likely he had privately held this view before, although it had not been made public. In the sermon above mentioned he expressed himself as opposed to some, in his judgment, rather old views and doctrines concerning the significance of the work of Christ, and he urged with big words the necessity of leaving man's theology and returning to, as he said, what is really written in the Bible, that is, every one that wanted to be saved must have what he called *the Bible* view of God and the One He sent, Jesus Christ, and of the atonement or reconciliation through Christ's blood. It is not well known, or proven, whether he then doubted the divinity of Christ, or not.

The views expounded by W. in the sermon alluded to are summarized by himself as follows:

"1. No change took place in God's disposition towards man in consequence of sin.

2. Therefore there was no hindrance to man's salvation in any anger or wrath that had filled the heart of God in consequence of man's sin.

3. The change that took place in consequence of man's sin, was a change only in man that made him sinful so that he turned away from God and the life that is in Him

4. On account thereof man needed a reconciliation in order to be saved, but no reconciliation to appease God and again make him gracious towards man, but one that took away the sins of man and made him righteous again;

5. This reconciliation is accomplished in Jesus Christ.

This sermon was justly and earnestly attacked by Rev. P. P. Welinder, in his excellent paper "*Forsamlingsvannen*"—(The Church Friend).

Waldenstrom answered in a pamphlet, entitled "Forsoningens betydelse"—(The significance of the atonement.)

Of this red hot polemical pamphlet I had the honor of receiving one of the very first copies that reached this country and perused it after earnest prayer to God that I might not be drawn away from the simplicity of faith in the Gospel as it is in Christ. To begin with I nearly gave away to his skill in maltreating scripture texts in order to explain away the everlasting truth and with the *letter* of the Bible prove and defend a peculiar scholastic philosophy, the very foundation of which is only vain and worldly reasonings in direct opposition to the very spirit of the holy Bible. But having in a very short time found out that this was the case, I found it the wisest to retain my "preconceived opinions" concerning the subjects touched upon. When I once, while meditating on these subjects in connection with W's, new book, preached about Christ bearing our sins in his own body on the tree (1 Peter 2 : 24) I found that W. left nothing of the foundation for man's salvation, and that he was trying to imitate Socinus in the 16th century, concerning whose doctrines his ardent followers felt pleased to declare :

"The old Roman Babylon is fallen. Luther tore off the roof; Calvin pulled down the walls; but our Socinus digged away the very foundations."

Yes indeed, Socinus tried to dig away the only foundation of all Christendom, "for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3 : 11).

I decided to continue to "preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God, because the foolishness of God is wiser than men," (1 Cor. 1.) Praise be to the Lord, the word of God is plain and without ambiguity on this main doctrine, and it teaches us *an accomplished reconciliation* as well as a *Reconciler* to believe in.

As I will show after a while, W. went further and further in

his protests against the established and accepted truth and revelation of God. In his first book on the Atonement he made the Bible teach, that *not God but the world* was the object of an already perfected reconciliation, but now he teaches, that God nowhere in His word teaches about a general reconciliation of the world, finished once for all, but that the individual gets reconciled to God, when he believes in Christ.

When he had published his pamphlet on the Atonement, his new views were ably opposed by some of the leading men in the Lutheran State Church: We must consider, that the Church never opposed the Waldenstromian movement from any other reason than the one found in the fundamental doctrinal difference between the Lutheran Church—yea the whole Christian Church—and the Waldenstromian movement. Among those who wrote against Waldenstrom I take liberty to mention some that are highly esteemed on account of their learning and piety: Bishop A. F. Beckman, Dr. P. Tjellstedt, Professor M. G. Rosenius, and the pious and popular Court preacher Rev. G. E. Beskow.

Among many other good suggestions given to W. was that he ought not to fling his yet unripe views out among people in general, but write in some language that only could be read by men that were learned and able justly to consider and answer them. W. took the hint and published a pamphlet in Latin of 55 pages (large 8vo.), entitled: "De Justificatione quid Statuant Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Lutheranae," dedicated to "doctissimo viro, A. F. Beckman, Philosophico et Theologico Doctori, Episcopo." In the preface to this remarkable effort, he states that he had found nothing in the symbolical books that could change his views. He says: "Neque quiddam in iis inveni, quod sententiam meam mutare posset." The symbolical books are not clear on the doctrine of justification by faith, W. says. They dwell not fully enough on redemption. They are not orthodox, he says. "Nam quod dicendum fuit: 'Propter misericordiam per Christum mediatorem,' dixerunt. 'Per misericordiam propter Christum propitiatorem.'" Well, how could one expect, that our symbolical books should be orthodox, when their very fountain, the Holy Bible is not found by W. to be so.

The word justification is used in the S. B. in a threefold meaning, he states: 1. Significat enim justum aliquem reputare sine pronunciare. 2. Efficere ut justus aliquis reputatur. 3. Justum aliquem ex injusto efficere seu regenerare." This last view is accepted by the author. Salvation, justification and regeneration are all exactly congeneric things for him—different expressions denoting the same thing, seen from different sides.

But this pamphlet written, if I remember correctly, especially an account of his discussion before the bishop and the consistory, was his only effort to put forth his new views in any other language than his mother tongue. Some of his books have lately been translated in English, namely "The Reconciliation," "The Lord is Right," meditations on the twenty-fifth of David's Psalms, which is surely one of his most dangerous works, in which he under the most pious pretense carries away his blind-folded followers from the true gospel as it is in Christ Jesus. Another of his works, translated in English is "The blood of Jesus."

The first mentioned book "the Reconciliation" is an enlargement of the pamphlet, "The Significance of the Atonement," and the polemical matter has been omitted, the book is now incorporated in his large work, "God's Eternal plan of Salvation."

Many years—about 17 years—ago one of his first efforts, a little book called "Benkspatron Adamson, Mir Hvar bor du ?" (Sir Adamson, the Factory Owner: or, Where do you live?) was translated for "The Lutheran Observer," published in Philadelphia. His book, The Lord is Right—(Herren aï from") has been translated into German and published in Bremen and Leipsic under the title: "Der Herr ist fromm" The meaning of the Swedish and German word "from" is "upright," "mild," "pious" or "kind."

II.

Concerning W's doctrinal views one of his many admirers and followers among his own countrymen in this land says with reference to his book on Reconciliation: He is thoroughly loyal to the Bible, he finds in it nothing to deny and nothing to explain away: with him there is no denying of the full, absolute divinity of Christ, no belittling of sin or of the punishment due

to it, no questioning of the justice or wrath of God.—rather the reverse of all this: he lays greater stress on all these facts than do most of his opponents. He brings no pet theory to the Bible to be proved or defended by it; he simply asks: "Blessed Book, what dost thou teach?" And then HE (!!) records the answer. Hence, he mentions and combats no theories by name—whether the moral, the vicarious, the governmental, or any other. If you *must* have a name for the author's view, call it the Scriptural, or the Biblical, one,—"the Bible View of the Atonement."

This refers of course to his *latest* view of this precious subject. As I told you before, he held another view of it when he first switched off from the good and reliable old track, than he held later on. When he had done his best to prove that *God* by no means was the object of the propitiation made by Christ in his sufferings and death, the learned but erring professor somehow or other came to ask himself where in the Bible he really found the doctrine that *the world* was indeed reconciled to God. So he searched and searched, but could not at all find what he before so masterly had proved to be the perfect truth of the Bible. He saw also with his own eyes, that the world as such, far from being reconciled to God, is still alienated from God and an enemy to him.

But now W. is old enough to speak for himself. Let us then see, how he denies the vicarious atonement of Christ. He writes in a letter to his "dear brother Theophilus" in his and his coadjutor Rev. Ekman's paper, *The Witness*, as follows:

"Of late great changes have taken place in Christian views. A plain evidence thereof is the fact that a catechism now has been published, in which nothing is said concerning Christ's sufferings, as a suffering of punishment for the payment of our sins, the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, the reconciliation of God, the fulfilling of the law by Christ in our stead, etc.,—these points were formerly considered as very necessary foundations for all true Christianity."

Here he implies, that these points are now no more necessary foundations for true Christianity.

In another letter to the same friend on page 28 of the same volume he writes:

"As you know I have in my writings zealously combated the doctrine that God should have imputed to Christ the guilt of our sins."

Again W. writes: "If it only anywhere were written that God spares sinners on the ground that Christ has done and suffered everything which was requisite for our atonement! But it is precisely this which nowhere is written. That God has made Christ, through suffering, a perfect Prince of Salvation, and that he now saves sinners by implanting them in Christ,—that is what Scripture teaches," (p. 339).

Again he writes: "It is the work of theology to christen a pagan conception, which has been the cause that man has changed the Father from the *subject* to the *object* of the atonement. That Scripture teaches that God has been reconciled; concerning this the theological gentlemen in general agree,—as much so as it is certain that Scripture never says it. It is certain that in Scripture not a word is spoken concerning a satisfaction given to the Law. Nay, that whole talk is human fiction. It is not at all unholy to forgive sins without satisfaction for an offence, which has been committed. Yea, it is heathenism to teach, that God would come in conflict with his holiness if he forgave sins without having first received satisfaction for the offence which his law had suffered. Neither is that doctrine found in the Word of God. Certain it is that, while the Augsburg Confession teaches that we for Christ's sake have a gracious God, Scripture teaches, that we for the sake of the grace of God have Christ, and that is surely not one and the same thing." (pp. 298, 301, 302).

A little further on in the same volume W. writes: "Scripture never says that God does anything for Christ's sake. That God for Christ's sake condemns the ungodly,—that is written precisely in as many passages as this: that He for Christ's sake justifies the sinner. Nowhere is it said in the word of God that God is gracious to us for Christ's sake,—nay, all that is *fiction*, (p. 337).

Again: "The *object* of the life, death, resurrection, and the whole work of Christ was undoubtedly this: that we should receive forgiveness of sins, be sanctified and blessed. But that is

something different from this: that God, *on account of this work*, should forgive, sanctify, and make blessed," (p. 301).

Further testimony as to the Socinian character of W's theology might be unnecessary. Most likely we all feel somewhat like juryman Culver when he in open court during the Cronin trial exclaimed: "*We have heard enough!*"

But I must give you some few selections out of W's book, "The Reconciliation" published in this city some weeks ago.

On pp. 57, 58 he says:

1. "The atonement which was typified by the sacrifices (of the O. T.) never aimed at appeasing or compensating God by means of vicarious penal suffering.
2. God is never in the law of sacrifices mentioned as the object of the atonement.
3. The atonement typified by the sacrifices consisted in the taking away of sins, and the cleansing of sinners before God.
4. Always *sinners* or *their sins* are set forth as the objects of the atonement.
5. God is spoken of as the one from whom the atonement proceeds."

On page 93 he gathers the principal lessons from Rom. v. 10 thus: "If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life:"

1. "All men are by nature enemies of God, because they are carnally minded;
2. The entire work of God in reconciliation does therefore tend to this, that he may by it reconcile enemies to himself.
3. Consequently, all who have ever become reconciled have become so as enemies, that is, at the time when they were enemies, or in a state and condition of enmity to God."

On that same text he says on pp. 88, 89: "The question has been raised that the whole world, apart from all consideration of and every condition as to faith and repentance, was reconciled to God on the day when Christ died."

We remember from what has been said before, that W. thought and taught so when he first had turned what we call "a Waldenstromian" [hoc est, Anselmian or Socinian,] but listen now to

his present wisdom—or to “what is written in God’s word” now-a-days!—

W. continues about this text, “When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” and says: “Who are then the “we” of whom he speaks? Are they the world? The apostle speaks of himself and believers, not of the world. “*By the death of his Son.*” Does not this mean, “the day when Christ died?” Answer. It is not thus written. Neither does the apostles ever say in any other place that we were reconciled to God on the day when Jesus died. “*By the death of Jesus*” is never the same as “*on the day when Jesus died.*” All who now are justified and righteous, the living and happy children of God, have become so by or through the death of Jesus; but this does not at all mean that they became such on the day when Jesus died. The apostle Peter, also, says to the Christians that they have been “begotten again unto a living hope *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead* (1 Peter 1, 3), but this does not mean that they, without faith and repentance, had been born again *on the day when Christ arose from the dead.* Hence, when Paul says, “by the death of Jesus,” then he expresses—just as the words read—the means, but not the time, of their reconciliation,—*how, not when, they were reconciled.*”

On pp. 69, 70 he writes:

“Mark how everything in this matter aims at this: to eliminate or clear out from humanity that deadly poison—sin—which Satan has injected into us, and to restore us unto God so thoroughly clean and holy as he originally had created us.

And this through the blood of Christ, by making us partakers of the life of Christ, as the Apostle John says: “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin (1 John 1 : 7). The blood of Christ is a poison for sin. As sin has been for us a poison causing our death, so the blood of Christ is for sin a poison causing its death and our quickening in righteousness.”

This is W’s entire conclusion from all that the N. T. says concerning Christ filling the office of our High Priest.

Thinking that he had done a masterly thing he says in closing the chapter:

“O my soul, rest and breathe here. Take deep breaths of

this heavenly air, for great is your God, and great are his works. Praise be to God forever for his unspeakable gift!"

In what spirit he contemplates all these holy things appears all over in his writings. Let me give one or two specimens:

On page 41 in his book on reconciliation he says: "It is more righteous to forgive for nothing than to forgive for payment, and therefore God is first and foremost in forgiving for nothing, because he is first and foremost in righteousness. If God, in the times of the Old Testament, forgave sins on the ground of a coming payment, then that would mean, that in those times he forgave sins *on credit*. But that is a degrading thought concerning God and his righteousness."

But see here a still better sample. On page 224 in his "*Witness*" for 1878 he gives the following *Prize Conundrum*:

When one teaches, 1. that God on account of his justice cannot forgive sins without payment being made for the same; 2. that God on account of his selfsame justice never could collect payment twice, and that consequently no one can be condemned for the sins paid by Christ, then we may question, if unbelief, on account of which men are condemned, is not a sin, or if not *that* sin is also paid for? If the sin of unbelief is paid for, can any one then be condemned on account of it? Or if it is not paid for, how can it then be forgiven, as no sins can be forgiven, that are not paid for?" What sophistry!!

If time would permit, we could easily show, that W. is a Socinian protestant even in denying the deity of Christ. Or what shall we say about the following correspondence that we read on pp. 282, 283 of *The Witness* for 1878:

"Doctor Waldenstrom: In the name of Jesus! some distressed souls ask you to give a definite answer to this question: Do you consider it to be the doctrine of the Scriptures, that Christ, not only as man, but also as the Son of God, is less than the Father; *i. e.*, do the words of Jesus, 'The Father is greater than I,' mean that Jesus is inferior to the Father, and consequently not true God, equal with the Father? Pardon the trouble, but for the sake of the Lord, Herr Doctor will certainly serve severely distressed brothers and sisters."

To this the learned and cold-blooded professor of Christian

theology gave the following answer—published in his “*Witness*”:

“Dear Friend,—As an answer to your letter, I have nothing more to say, than that *I am unable to solve the question addressed to me. I lack a decided conviction in this thing*; but when I write concerning it, I state the words of the Bible, without further commentary, as they read, and if anyone feels distressed on account thereof I cannot help it. Explain away the Bible I will and can by no means. Concerning everything I do not understand I think thus: the day might come when I do comprehend it; and until then I simply cling to the Lord Jesus. Amen.”

Judge now for yourselves, kind reader. The man is a very skillful controversialist, and often conceals his errors and deceives by the use of orthodox terms. In other places he says that he *always* held fast the doctrine about the divinity of Christ.

When W. during June, July and August 1889, preached about 90 sermons in 17 different states to about 200,000 of his country-men in this country, he very often dwelt upon this topic, the divinity of Christ, and wanted the people to understand that he by no means was such a heretic as “Augustana” had proclaimed. But even Channing, Socinus and Arius *always* call Jesus divine; yet neither did they, nor does Dr. Waldenstrom confess Jesus in the words and sense of the ancient Ecumenical Creed, “God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one Substance with the Father,” which is the true test of orthodoxy on the Deity of Christ; but W. proclaims that he has no “decided conviction” on this question and that he doesn’t trouble himself much about it, even if some of his disciples feel distressed about it. Now enough on this point.

Another truth W. denies on pp. 31, 32 of *The Witness* for 1878: He says in his usual outspoken way, that it is nowhere written in the word of God, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son. Even this denial is an echo of an olden time error in the history of the Church.

And now in order to make a long history short may it suffice to say, that Waldenstrom also holds Donatistic views of the Church of Christ here on earth. The Church according to his ideas

shall fully correspond to the true invisible Church. Only "believers" belong to the Church," says he. He undermines the faith of men in the objective value of the means of grace, and tries to set up such a church as has never really existed—and surely does not exist among the Waldenstromian separatists neither in Sweden nor in this country. A professor of theology in the Lutheran Church ought to know that these views are in direct conflict with the eighth article of the Augsburg Confession and, what is more, they are in conflict with the sayings of our Lord and Saviour himself concerning his own Church.

We Lutherans, who know what and in whom we believe are done with W. and his teachings. Denying as he does and explaining away, as far as he is able, the very fundamental truth of the word of God, Christ's satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of the world, how can he reasonably be expected to be able rightly to explain and teach any other Bible doctrine?

When the premises are wrong, the conclusions must necessarily be perverted and corrupt.

ARTICLE III.

THE SABBATH SCHOOL AS A FACTOR IN RELIGIOUS TRAINING.

By REV. PROF. B. F. PRINCE, A. M., Springfield, O.

In one of our leading theological journals there appeared not long ago, an article of unusual interest under the caption, "The Outcomes of the Bible." The author endeavored to show that while there are many positive commands in the word of God, which no man can mistake, there also are many principles which lie hidden under general statements whose force and power may not be realized for ages to come, but under the influence of superior education and spiritual advancement, they come forward and demand a place for themselves among the Christian activities of the age. Hence Vinet could ask : "And know you not that the Bible includes many more truths than it expresses? And that it is one of its excellencies that it suggests, that it excites a mul-

titude of ideas which it includes virtually, though not actually.* The Bible is "an unique book emptying out into the centuries its pent up treasures. There is nothing else like it in the realm of letters. From no other book do so many varied things, not apparent, spring forth, new theology, new ethics, new potencies in politics, political economy, social science, humanity, civilization."† We may add to this list, new methods and new agencies in the spread of the Gospel. There are many things done by the Church to-day which have come to the front under an enlightened study of the word. The Sabbath School may be set down as one of the practical outcomes of the Bible.

During mediæval times a wall was thrown around the sacred word. The age of teaching which the apostles and their successors had so fully inaugurated, and by which the wide dissemination of the Gospel had been so successfully accomplished, was followed by one in which men were called to witness the formal services of religion, without a clear understanding of what these ceremonies implied, and during which period there was but little attempt at any explanation of the word of God. As up on the sacred mountain the people were not allowed to gaze upon the wonderful appearance of the Lord as he communicated with Moses, so during this dark period the authorities of the Church withheld from the people that close communion with the word which alone is conducive to the highest type of religious development. But the Reformation changed the relation of the clergy, the people, and the word. The Bible was brought out from the darkness in which it had long been hid, the laity who were so long held in subserviency to the priesthood were elevated in knowledge and in dignity, and Christian development put on a plane unknown for ages past.

The reformers were at once conscious of the importance and necessity of thorough teaching. With Luther the ability to teach was a necessary qualification in a good preacher, so that he declared no man ought to become a minister unless he first had experience in teaching the young. That the young should be thoroughly taught the essential truths of the Bible he equally insisted on. To carry out his idea he produced his catechism

*Vinet's Homiletics, p. 98.

†Biblio. Sac., Oct., 1886.

which he asserted should not only be committed to memory by the pupils but should be explained to them, word by word, and he also declared that every child under such instruction might know the truths of the Gospel by the time he was ten years of age. But long before Luther's time there were methods and schools for giving instruction in religion. That the teaching of the young, the stranger, and the family under the command of Moses, that the instruction given regularly in the Jewish Synagogue, and where schools must be established provided there were twenty-five boys, all to be thoroughly indoctrinated in the sacred writings, show a type of the modern Sabbath School is quite plain. Then the catechetical instruction pursued by all the reformers contemporary with Luther, and afterwards by Wesley, who for more than thirty years before the time of Robert Raikes, was in the habit of gathering together the children for religious instruction, show a trend of practical, religious thought towards means and methods of training the young that finds its full exhibition in the modern Sabbath School.

I. Its work is essentially one of training. This implies hard, persistent labor. It demands that time and service must be expended in bringing about certain results. Men do not shrink from making such efforts if they can see gain from them. The greatness of the civilization of to-day is from persistent effort. The men of a generation ago were not willing to do things by the slow processes of their fathers, or be satisfied with the kinds of products that they had witnessed in their childhood. Their hearts were set on larger things. They believed that greater results were within reach, if sought after with greater toil. They spared no pains, and we now see the fruit of their labors in the wealth and grandeur of our material, scientific, mechanical, and commercial interests. But all these vast improvements were the results of long and patient training, until the powers of mind and body were capable of responding to the wishes that prompted those who were eager in the race for material prosperity.

Training is a necessity for the growing mind; not toward material things alone are we to bend our energies, but on that higher order of our creation, the mind and heart, are we to exert all our energies, that morality, spiritual life, and noble manhood

may keep pace with the growth of material things around us. The field that lies before us is bound to bring some kind of harvest. The American boy will think ; he is born with an active mind, and he pushes his investigations in directions that often astonish his parents who are dreaming that he is only yet a child. Our day schools which are of such remarkable character, quicken the energy and arouse the ambition of the young mind, and make it susceptible to influences and aspirations that need to be brought under the strictest forms of religious teachings. The young mind will think ; about what shall it think ? The young mind will grow ; what shall be the direction of its growth ? The young mind will fall under some species of moral influence ; what shall that influence be ? These are questions that should interest every lover of the Church and the country. We cannot ignore the fact that there are millions of young people in our land whose minds and hearts are yet susceptible to the highest and noblest principles if presented to them with earnest consideration by those who should have their welfare at heart. The next generation will be largely what this generation chooses to make it. It is so because the young are readily moulded in thought and purpose by their parents, and by their teachers. In life men are usually characterized by the principles with which they were familiar in the days of their childhood. The mind rarely forgets the scenes and impressions of youth. The law of its growth is true to nature ; it assimilates that which comes to it, and the fashion of it is according to the mental food that comes in its way. Hence the great necessity of coming in contact with these young minds and training them with all diligence and urging with assurance of full success those principles that will be life and power to those that are now in the bright and joyous period of their existence.

What are the means which we are to employ in our training? The world is full of complexities ; the interests of society are vast in form and number. Some see nothing but material things, and so declare that the young should look only to those pursuits that bring more food, more worldly prosperity, and which satisfy the demands of the physical being. Arithmetic will help

a man to calculate and aid him to succeed among his fellows, hence study arithmetic; study anything that finds its issue in dollars and cents. In these latter times the study of science has brought large aid to man. It has made steamboats, railroads, telegraphs, numerous applications of electricity, hence study science. By this the world is growing rich and enjoying comforts and luxuries that are almost as wonderful as those wrought by the magical lamp of Aladdin. There are many who imagine that all these achievements are the result of labors entirely independent of Christianity, that it has had nothing to do in their discovery, ignoring altogether that quickening of the mind which springs out of those influences which are the direct product of Christian life and virtue. Nor can we for one moment deny the educating power of the sciences. They are a wonderful school and he who knows them has in his grasp forces that are a mighty agency to assist him in the struggle for life. They are a means for training that are everywhere recognized as powerful and fraught with great benefit to man.

But to make the full grown, well equipped man, possessing those finer qualities of manhood, that stamp him as a prince among his fellows, there is something in addition to his other training needed. The Bible is a book better than all other agencies to awaken the sleeping energies and give a right impulse to life. It is not a book of science; it stands in the way of no real science, it antagonizes no fact in nature. It is not a history merely, though it has in it the grandest record that the world has ever heard, but it is a book of principles illustrated by many practical examples, and which, if faithfully studied and applied, bring no shame to any man in his dealings with his fellow man. This book is like a spring that has within it some medicinal property. The water is not the property, but the property is in the water, which gives it a character that determines it as good or bad wherever known. Taste it at the fountain and it is there, carry it in bottles a thousand miles away and it is still there. So the principles of the Bible have their place in all human life and history. Men when permeated with them, in thought and character, manifest their training though they may go to the ends of the earth to find a habitation. More than three thou-

sands years ago Moses through the divine agency laid down these foundation principles in the commandments. Their acceptance and practice made of the Jews a peculiar and wonderful people. But in due time a greater than Moses came. His life and words have become the heritage of the Church and the world. How the world has been touched by his sayings! Since that time its development has been peculiar. In countries that have become thoroughly Christian the fashion of society and governments have undergone many changes. The whole machinery of Europe and America is developing around the principles that the Saviour announced to man. His words have indeed been power and life. As was intended, they are fashioning the very foundations of society, transmitting, transforming the mind and heart, and the purposes of men. The Bible as a means is doing more than any other single agency in training the world, breaking up old foundations and theories and inciting men to new rules and methods of life. This is the agency that we are to use in moulding the mind and hearts of the children. Science, business, handicrafts, hard toil in daily life, are all necessary. We should teach them as well as we can to our children, and train them to use each to best advantage. But above all is the word of God. It is the vitalizing force which penetrating every fiber of society must give tone and quality to human government, peace and happiness among men, and hope and comfort to all classes of mankind. It is full of principles which encourage and repress; it declares what men may do or not do, and hence serves as a pruning knife, lopping off here and there a bad habit, giving turn to a right impulse, and showing the path that leads to a lofty and a noble life. We have here then a mighty aid in training the young. It is not an untried help offered to us as an experiment, but centuries bear witness to its value, and experience accords it a place as the chief agent in subduing the passions of men. The book has done its work efficiently in the past, it will continue to do so in the future if its principles are laid before the young before the evil days come when they shall have no pleasure in them.

II. What the effect of Sabbath School training has been and is likely to be, on the children is a matter of great importance.

If they are improved by it, if they are better with such training than without it, then is it wise that our efforts should be continued that the best interest of society and the Church may be promoted?

Theoretically and practically, training in the Sabbath School makes the scholars more thoughtful and intelligent. How could it be otherwise? Take the lessons that we have from Sabbath to Sabbath; they deal with the profoundest questions and the most interesting records that have to do with our race. They commence with man in his innocence, they record his fall and the efforts made to give him a new start toward that divine life which he had lost. They tell us of a single man picked out from the multitudes that then were living upon the earth, and though far advanced in life, without off-spring, it was told him that his seed should be as the stars of heaven or as the sands of the seashore for multitude. They find a stripling watching the sheep in the solitudes of the mountain, and from this occupation, because an excellent spirit was in him, he is made the ruler of his nation. Or they make us acquainted with the man of sorrows from his birth to his crucifixion and ascension, they tell us of his toil, his shame, and his glory, how he restored men from their infirmities and made them rejoice in both bodily and spiritual healings, and how he declared himself the way, the truth, and the life; to whom men must come if they desire recovery from sin, and to have a hope of eternal happiness in the world to come. At the age at which most of our scholars are found, such lessons could not be presented to their attention without producing thoughtful feelings, especially if they are pressed home with an honest and earnest heart. There, in the little congregation presided over by the teacher as pastor, an opportunity is afforded for pressing home the truth that the pastor in his larger audience does not have. The encounter here is personal. The question is to the individual scholar. He is made to feel its full force; under its application the blood flows more quickly through the veins, and the mind is made to survey itself in a more scrutinizing manner than ever before. The thought of all these things cannot be brushed away in a day, but these lessons rise in memory with a suggestive power that sways every motive

of the mind and heart. It must be too, that every scholar under the force of earnest teaching will become more intelligent than he would otherwise be. There is a wonderful amount of history, geography, philosophy, poetry, morality, and religious example that passes before the mind of the scholar as he studies the lessons for each year. The careful acquisition of these enlarges his mental vision and increases his knowledge in many directions that will be of vast benefit to himself in after life. An early acquaintance with the book of books which must more or less result from its weekly perusal will become a source of mental profit that no man can estimate.

Such training of the children makes them more churchly. We ought to bring the young to love the Church with all the might and power of affection; love it because it is a fostering parent to them, established by the Redeemer of the world to be an instrument for the furthrance of the Gospel. Young people who have no church home or church love are hard to reach. They have no ties by which they are fastened, and hence float about on an ever restless tide without spiritual compass or gospel mooring. But once get them attached to the very place in which they meet, and have them to understand something of the great company of believers who make up the Lord's people, and that all the privileges of the house of God are for their sole good, and much will have been done towards securing their love for the church in which they have been so tenderly reared. The influence of the Sabbath School is to do this. It offers to them a home where they can pass an hour with pleasure and profit each week, together studying the same words; thinking about and being moved by the same ideas and thoughts, and appreciating in common, a common good. Such experiences draw each scholar closer to the place of his weekly worship and in time he comes to look with tender love on everything that may belong to the place associated with so many happy memories.

Through the training of the Sabbath School a benevolent spirit is cultivated. The child never taught to give, but only to save, may be in a fair way to get rich, but not to be benevolent. He may be allowed to spend his money for his own personal

gratification only, but thereby he will become selfish and sordid. A noble type of character is one which feels for others woes, and is willing to reach forth the hand and help a fallen brother, or aid a noble cause. The Sabbath School scholar has a training in this direction that will tell vastly on his future life. In a school well conducted he is made acquainted with the condition of those who need help, struggling amid the duties of missionary work, both at home and abroad. He learns to know the story of want and privation of the people of his own church in the far distant West, or it may be of the destitution of those in his own village or city; he hears of the deeper want of the millions of benighted heathen lands who know not God, and he is asked to give to the relief of all who may be in need. When he thus gives, he gives intelligently, and thus early learning the grace of giving, he is likely to grow up a liberal hearted person, ready to bestow his benefactions on every worthy object. Through such early and beneficent training no doubt much of the recent benevolence which is so marked in the Church is due. The large benefactors of to-day who dispose so liberally of their wealth for missions, for education and for all purposes in the work of the Church, were a quarter of a century or more ago, the children of the Sabbath School, in training for this wonderful day of progress in noble things. The whole Church has risen to a degree of benevolence toward all causes that look to the improvement of society which can only be accounted for on the ground, that the educating force of systematic giving in the days of youth are now bringing forth their fruit in enlarged liberality. This field for cultivating a liberal spirit has done great things in the past by laying foundations broad and deep, and through the influence which it exerts no doubt will come much of the power that will aid in evangelizing the world.

The Sabbath School further trains by getting the children to do missionary work. Schools are often built up by inciting the young people to go out and hunt up those who attend no school. The motive for their going may not always be the highest, but the fact that they do go, and that they secure the attendance of a friend or stranger places them in the line of local missionaries. This, too, is a matter of great gain in Christian activity. It

starts a current that is not likely to stop. When a scholar secures one recruit he is better prepared to get a second; the spirit for work grows on him, and the outcome of it no man can tell. It is said that there are more than five thousand young men in this country who are ready to go into the foreign field as missionaries. How comes it that these in such large numbers stand waiting to go on their mission as soon as all needed preparations can be made? It must be from the training that they have received, especially in the Sabbath School. Their minds have been directed to the needs of all mankind for the Gospel, the utter destitution of heathen lands, and then, having been taught by experience the value of personal labor in winning others to the cause of the Church, they become easily willing to make whatever sacrifice is demanded to engage in the mission fields whether at home or abroad. A personal knowledge of what it is to win another to a good cause, and years of growing familiarity with the benefits derived therefrom, have no doubt in these better days made an army of faithful workers in the great Christian activities of the age, and especially in the mission field, a grand possibility and fact.

Thorough training of the young in the Sabbath School lays the foundation for better citizenship. A gentleman who does not believe the Bible not long ago said to the writer, that the Church and Sabbath School ought not to stop their work, because vice and crime must be repressed, and that he did not know that anything better, if so good, could be found to do this, reminding us of a saying uttered long ago, "For their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being judges." The two great laws formulated by our Saviour, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" are the burden of every lesson. These express the highest type of duty and relationship, and when well enforced and imbedded in the mind and heart they help much to make the perfect man. No better foundation for good citizenship could be laid, for every just government grows out of a high regard for morality and virtue by the people who support it.

Not long ago the great German scholar, Delitzsch, in an article

in the *Sunday School Times*, was pleased to call the American people the Bible people. It was indeed a high compliment, and the question at once arose, whether it was deserved. If we were measured by the standard of critical scholarship, there is no doubt that our German friends would far outstrip us, for they have examined with a scrutinizing eye every line and letter of the revealed word. Their knowledge is microscopic in character. But when it comes to a general knowledge by the nation, with a purpose, too, to observe the principles laid down in the word in the administration of law and order, better perhaps than any other nation on the face of the earth, there is no doubt that his observation is correct. The fundamental principles of good government can all be found in the Bible. He who studies it well and obeys its teachings will be a peaceful and upright citizen. We have become a Bible people above other lands, because each Sabbath day more interested students of that book sit down to a systematic study of it in the United States than in any other country, taking into account, of course, comparative populations. So far, too, as such study contributes to an enlarged understanding of the word, to that degree is it instrumental in making men good and obedient subjects of the governments under which they live.

III. When we come to examine the general effect of such training on the Church we observe, that it makes a more intelligent and efficient church membership. A properly trained boy always makes an intelligent and useful man. The broader the foundation the more thorough and capable he is likely to become. The Church built up of material that has been fashioned and moulded in the Sabbath School, must be a far more intelligent and efficient one, than it would be without material so prepared. Our day schools have long since practically given up the teaching of morals. They have turned this duty over to the Church. The time was when this was not so. The Bible was a leading book in the schools of the land. But now our day schools busied with the rudiments of mere worldly knowledge, and because a few busy meddlers are fearful that sectarianism may be taught, cannot furnish us that cultivated material out of which the happiest and most proficient state of the Church is to be found. We must

look for it elsewhere. It comes from the boys and the girls who have sat for years under the faithful tutelage of earnest Sabbath School workers. It comes well taught in all the duties of a consecrated life, it comes well established in all the fundamental principles of the Gospel, and when so shaped and fashioned it is efficient in doing whatever service it is directed to perform. Many people would be willing to work if they only knew how. It is the spirit of Sabbath School training to teach them how, to make them capable for efficient usefulness in all the relations of church membership, and it seems that it has largely succeeded.

A further effect of Sabbath School training in the Church is to stir it up to diligent duty; not indeed to that degree that it ought to be stirred, but urging it to reach a far higher plane than it would if such an institution did not exist. The school must have teachers, who must sit before inquiring scholars and have their ignorance exposed if they do not choose to study. Few persons are willing to pass such an ordeal, but being impressed with a responsibility to work they prepare to meet the demands of their classes. Who could say that this was not a vast gain for intelligent and active duty? There are thousands of devoted teachers in our land whose earnest thoughts go out the week long in search of the best methods of bringing home the truths of the lesson for the coming Sabbath to the hearts and consciences of those who are their pupils. They secure the best helps to elucidate the lesson to their own minds, and thus bring themselves into active sympathy with the best interests of the Church. Let us conceive that the Church has abandoned the work of Sabbath School instruction, and that the army of teachers has been relieved from their toilsome work in the preparation of the lesson; how soon would the vast majority relapse into indifference and neglect, and the once intelligent laity become a lazy and careless people. No people are so easily pleased with the services of the ministry as those who are well informed and intelligent in Bible knowledge. Such are not likely to look for mistakes or cultivate a criticising spirit. Their sympathies are with every good work and purpose. Our schools help to build up such a people. They stir up the Church and

aid in keeping it from a stagnant condition. No age ever had a more active laity than this, and no age has ever laid so wide and deep the religious foundations for practical work as the one in which we live.

IV. The effect of the Sabbath School on society at large is also marked. Its purposes are good; its aim is to build and improve mankind. It deals with the best moral principles that the world knows and with these as an instrument for the development of moral character it fashions society into its most approved form. In its work it gets hold of the lowly as well as the high and leads them into loftier ways. That is the best instrument of reform which can and does take hold of the lowest conditions of society and overcomes corruption and plants the good seed of a better and holier life. To day our danger is, not from the well-behaved in society nor from the cultured class, nor from those who attend our churches, but from that larger class who have never yet been educated with a view to the best interests of our land. No government can long endure whose foundations are not based on religious ideas, be it pagan or Christian. The religious idea forms the bond that holds all the elements of society together with stronger grip than mere law or human device. When you touch the religious idea, you touch the heart. If a large part of the people of a country have no religious convictions, but on the other hand have feelings averse to it, the highest bond of unity for that nation is gone. To a great extent the war of the Revolution was carried on under the impulse of the religious idea which inspired true patriotism. In this country we must if possible have no large class whose education is away from the Bible. If we do, it will be our danger and our ruin. The best agency that the Church can use to avert this seems to be the Sabbath School. It has facilities peculiar to itself. It has many avenues of approach to the people unknown to other organizations. Its methods are more free and easy, its sociability is more marked. It can go out into the by-ways and hedges through its ever widening circle of friendship, and almost compel the people to come in. All who come, do so without any formal ceremony or rites of membership, and at once are made to feel at home in their new sur-

roundings. Its power can be seen in almost any neighborhood but especially in our large cities. Men are to-day preaching the Gospel who twenty years ago were "Wild Arabs" around the wharves or in the back alleys. In some mission school their attention was caught by kind and effective teaching, and their minds were given a direction toward the nobler things of life. If we are to evangelize fully this land of ours, bring the unmoulded classes under religious influence, the Sabbath School must do a large share of the work. It has the best methods, and can best reach that large class of persons who now look with unconcern, if not with hatred, on the Bible and the Church. Here is a picture of its noble work. In England during the last century, even before the time of Raikes, Nicholas Ferrar founded in Huntingdon shire, a Sabbath School. His nieces heard the children repeat the Psalms and such other portions of Scripture as might be designated. To get them to come, Mr. Ferrar offered every child present who could repeat a Psalm a penny and his dinner. As to the effect of the work done his biographer says: "The influence of this Sabbath School was such that the neighboring ministers declared a mighty change was wrought, not only on the children, but on the men and women at home, for the parents would naturally hear the children repeating their sacred lessons, whereas, heretofore their tongues had been exercised in singing lewd or profane songs, or, at least, idle ballads. Now the streets and doors resounded with the sacred poetry of David's harp. Thus it is that little children in multitudes of instances become the instructors of their parents, and this is one of the greatest encouragements which we have in the work of the Sabbath Schools. Such is the effect of our schools everywhere. Society is benefited, its tone raised, and thousands are led to become members of the Church who could not otherwise be reached.

The Sabbath School has inspired many a poor boy to a high and noble aim. Amid the new and strange surroundings of the school he hears the glad story of the Gospel by which he awakes to a new manhood and a new life. Here he learns that the poor but honest man is as good in the sight of the Lord as the rich and honorable man, that the Gospel is not for one class alone but for all men. Many a boy whose life began away

down among the poor and lowly, has under the quickening impulse of the truth learned here, sprung to the very top. It is the spirit of our land to push the boy of ready pluck, quick mind, and ambitious purpose to the very summit of power and influence. The way is open for every honest and determined youth to reach positions of honor and trust. A great agent to help him in this is the Sabbath School. It stirs him up to new manhood, it quickens the energies of the soul, and starts him on a grand march toward a great and important career. That it has succeeded well is the testimony of thousands who have been so helped. So long as it remains steady to its high aim, so long will it do a glorious work in encouraging the young to take a step that will put them on the high road to prosperity, honor, and usefulness in life.

V. While we find the Sabbath School such a glorious factor in religious training there are several dangers that may be briefly noticed. One is the danger of development away from the Church. The Church is supreme, all the work of the school should be done under and for the benefit of the Church. If any other spirit prevails the outcome will not be without harmful results. Some times the impression is made that the school is better than the Church, as though it were a different religious organization with ends wholly within itself. There must be no rivalry between the Church and school. The school is but a means to an end. It should teach that men may know the Gospel with the ultimate purpose of bringing them into the Church. Toward this should its every energy be directed, for this alone is it worthy of existence. That it is an institution of independent privileges, sometimes leads to the use of means and methods which compromise its sacred character, all done because it is not the Church. It should have no such development. Its whole tenor should be toward fostering everything that is sacred, and beneficial in church life.

Another danger, not so much springing from the school itself, is, that it is allowed to usurp altogether the place of parents in religious instruction. This is never in place, in a religious household. The school may be and no doubt is a great aid, but it cannot do all the work. It must do all for those who

come from non-religious households. There it has a great missionary work to perform, but not so in families whose parents are Christians. The parents know more about their children than the teacher, and their ministration can be more opportune and constant. For them to step aside and through indifference and neglect allow the religious trend of their children to be determined by a stranger is neither natural nor scriptural.

Neither is it well that the school should pass altogether from under the training eye of the pastor. No matter how good his teachers may be, there is still a place for him to review the work that is done, and see to it that the seed planted may develop into proper fruit. He can no more neglect his proper duties than can the parent. The weakness of the whole system is the voluntary nature of the attendance. Many methods have been used to overcome this but none last long. There is but one successful way : the teacher must make it so pleasant and profitable for the scholar when he is present, that it will be a delight for him to come again. "He that winneth souls is wise." Our whole system of Sabbath School instruction is to win souls. When the happy time comes, in which the parents, pastors and teachers all coöperate heartily in presenting the truths of the Bible, in holding up the value of religious instruction, and in making the scholars feel that the work in which they are engaged is one that is both pleasant and profitable, multitudes will gladly join the great company of those who are serving the Lord, and will help to swell the great chorus of triumphant victory in the great day of final accounts.

ARTICLE IV.

JESUS THE SON OF GOD.

By REV. S. SCHWARM, A. M., Tiffin, Ohio.

When Jesus came into the coast of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man am?" And they said, "Some say John the Baptist; some Elias; and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." And he said unto them, "But whom say ye that I am?" And Simon Peter, their spokesman, answered and said, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God."

These questions, at first sight, seem to have been inspired, as it has been suggested, by egotism. If a teacher or a preacher, in our day, were to go to his disciples and ask them what the people thought of him, he would be considered very vain and one who loves flattery. But there was a vast difference between Jesus asking these questions and the ordinary preacher. In the case of the preacher it makes little difference who he is, or what people think of him as a person, if they only receive the message he bears.

Not so, however, with Jesus. The entire force of his message depended on his personality. He claimed to be the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. But if he was a mere man he could not save. And although he was even the Son of God, if men yet thought him to be a mere man, they would not look to him for salvation. Hence the whole efficacy of his mission depended on whom men took him to be. He taught the people, healed their sick, fed the multitudes, and did many other wonderful works for the purpose of leading them to a right conception of his personality. What impression had he made on the people and, especially, on his disciples? Had they been led to look upon him as the Son of God, or what opinion had they formed of him? Great multitudes followed him, but why? Was it for the loaves and fishes, as he had intimated to the people after the feeding of the thousands and that they might have their sick

healed, or was it that they might have their souls fed with the bread of life, and be healed of their spiritual diseases?

Hence he asks his disciples the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" What idea have they formed of me as a person? Do they believe me to be the Son of man in the sense in which Daniel used the term, and consequently the Son of God, or do they believe me to be a mere man? They answered, "Some say that thou art John the Baptist," (this was Herod's solution), "some Elias, and others Jeremias or one of the prophets," or one of the *old* prophets, as one of the Evangelists puts it, the people all, according to this answer, seem to have been agreed as to the fact that he was a most remarkable personage. Was it possible that after the miracles he had wrought and the wonderful words of wisdom he had spoken, that none believed him to be divine, to be the Messiah. It was no wonder he turned to the disciples and said, "But whom say ye that I am?" Have you formed no more exalted idea of me than these? Am I to you also only a John the Baptist, or an Elias, or a Jeremias or one of the old prophets? Is it possible that no one has grasped the idea that I am the Son of God, the Christ? Have I wholly failed to impress my real personality upon the mind and heart of any? Not so! For the question is scarcely out of his mouth when Peter cries out—for himself and the others—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

How it rejoiced the Saviour's heart to find that his disciples—one of them at least—had grasped a clear conception of his person. For he cried out, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven."

Here we have two distinct and well defined opinions of the character, or person, of Jesus of Nazareth. The people said he was the greatest, the most remarkable, the best that humanity had ever been able to produce. They were ready to believe him superior to anything that their age could bring forth and were willing to receive him as the greatest of the past arisen from the dead. They readily believed him to be the greatest and best of all men, but they nevertheless still looked upon him as a man. To his disciples, to those who were the most intimate with him,

on the other hand, he was more than man, though man, he was nevertheless *the Christ* the Son of the living God. Who were right? The people, who said, "The best, the greatest of all men," or the disciples, who said, "The Christ, the Son of the living God."

These questions are still vital. They have lost none of their force by the lapse of time. Upon their answer hangs the weal or woe of humanity. If the people gave the true answer, then man has no one who is able to save him; but if the disciples were right, then man has an all-sufficient Saviour.

How are these questions answered at the present day, after a lapse of nineteen hundred years? Just as they were in the day when they were first asked. Who are right? Are they who cry the greatest and best of all men, or they who say, "The God-man," "God manifested in the flesh."

There are very few who have studied the character of Christ, and who are capable of giving an answer, but freely admit that Jesus of Nazareth was the very best of men. Many, who have been counted skeptics, have seemed to vie with each other in saying beautiful things about Jesus as a man.

John Stuart Mill—one of England's late noted philosophical writers—says: "About the life and sayings of Jesus there is a stamp of personal originality, combined with profundity of insight, which must place the prophet of Nazareth, even in the estimation of those who have no belief in his inspiration, in the very first rank of the men of sublime genius of whom our species can boast." He also says: "Even now it would not be easy, even for an unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete, than to endeavor so to live that Christ would approve his life."

Strauss—the great German infidel—who tried to prove that the divine Christ of the gospels was a mere myth, had to admit that the picture of Christ given in these gospels was the soul of religion. He says: "As little as humanity will be without religion, as little will it be without Christ. He remains the highest model of religion within our thoughts; and no perfect piety is possible without his presence in the heart."

Richter—the great German novelist—whom Joseph Cook

places at the head of the writers of fiction, says : "Jesus is the purest among the mighty, the mightiest among the pure, who, with his pierced hands, has raised empires from their foundations, turned the stream of history from its old channel, and still continues to rule and guide the ages."

Renan, the French infidel who has become so noted for his Life of Jesus, following in the track of Strauss, says : "Whatever be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will grow young without ceasing; his legend will call forth tears without end; his sufferings will melt the noblest hearts; all ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there is none born greater than Jesus."

Theo. Parker says : "The mightiest heart that ever beat, stirred by the spirit of God; how it wrought in his bosom! What words of rebuke, of comfort, counsel, promise, hope, did he pour out! What profound instruction in his proverbs, and discourses! What deep divinity of soul in his prayers, his actions, sympathy, resignation! It is for his truth and his life, his wisdom, goodness, piety, that he is honored in my heart—yea, in the heart of the world."

I might go on and quote to the same effect many others who admit the perfection of the character of Jesus of Nazareth as a man, who nevertheless deny that he was the Son of God, but these are enough to show the tenor of them all. They answer as "the people" did, "John the Baptist, etc." Now these sentiments about Jesus of Nazareth sound very well, but are they the true solution of his wonderful character, are they even consistent? How could a man be the purest and best of all men and yet deliberately make a claim which he knew to be false. Now Jesus deliberately claimed and asserted that he was the Son of God, and consequently, he was either what he claimed to be, or else he was a deceiver.

There can be no doubt about Jesus making the claim that he was the Son of God. It was for this claim that he was put to death. The indictment that he said that he was the King of the Jews, was a mere pretext to gain the consent of Pilate for his crucifixion. The real cause of his death was

declared when the High Priest said, "I adjure thee by the living God, tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God, or no." Jesus answered, "Thou hast said, and hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." The High Priest rent his clothes and cried, "Blasphemy!" "What need have we for further witnesses. You have heard it from his own mouth." And when they failed to prove the charge of treason against him before Pilate, and Pilate declared, "I find no fault in him," they returned to this charge, saying, "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. And it was for this claim that he did die. Now, how could a man who made such a claim, when he knew he was but a mere man, be the very best and purest of men? It is impossible. His enemies even said—and still say—"Never man spake as this man." A person who could deliver the Sermon on the Mount was not a weakling, or a fanatic laboring under a delusion. He knew what he was doing when he laid claim to being the Son of God. He knew that according to the Jewish mode of thought, and also to Jewish law, such a claim, if unfounded was blasphemy. He could not, consequently, after having deliberately made and maintained such a claim even unto death have been the best and purest of all men, if but a mere man. He could not have been a John the Baptist, for John shrank from making such a claim, and Elias, and Jeremias certainly never made such a claim. Hence this answer of "the people" and of the "some" of our times, cannot be the true solution of his personality.

But if Jesus of Nazareth could not have been the best and purest of men, as these make him out to be, what was he? Was he a deceiver? While it cannot be admitted, on the one hand, that Jesus was deceived as to his true personality, it cannot be admitted either, on the other hand, that he was a deceiver, namely, that he knew that he was but a mere man yet, nevertheless, for effect made the claim that he was the Son of God. It seems utterly impossible that one who exhibited such an exalted morality not only in word, but also in deed, should nevertheless be acting a lie in his entire life. It seems utterly impossible that one who gave himself up to doing good to oth-

ers, should nevertheless all the time be trying to deceive them in regard to his true nature. And all this too when he could not hope to gain anything thereby—but knew that he must suffer and die for claiming to be the Son of God, for he knew and told his disciples beforehand what they would do to him. Now it is not rational for one to carry a deception to such an extreme point—and do it knowingly—when he could not hope to gain anything thereby. Such a course of action would not be consistent with much wisdom or morality, all of which these skeptics admit he possessed to an extraordinary degree.

But what led Peter and the other disciples to believe he was the Christ? What leads us to confess him as the Christ? Is there any evidence that goes to show that though man, yet he was exalted infinitely above all men, and, consequently, divine? I have undertaken to show in a negative way that he could not have been a good man, if a mere man. I have also shown that he could not have been a weak or bad man, for that would have been utterly inconsistent with his whole character. But what positive evidence is there for believing that he was more than man, viz., the Son of Man and the Son of God? Is there anything that distinguishes him from all other men and shows him to be infinitely more than mere man? There are many things that thus distinguish him. Among them are the following.

1. He was a child of prophecy. A picture of him was drawn by a long line of artists, or writers. These artists were drawn from every social condition. Kings, judges, captains, courtiers, shepherds, herdsmen and others wrought at it. They painted in different countries and in different centuries. The picture was begun in the wilderness 1500 years before its ideal was realized, and it was 1000 years or more in painting. For more than 400 years the finished picture waited for its realization. The Jews said, "Where is he of whom Moses and the prophets caught a glimpse?" In the meantime the Scriptures containing this picture were translated into other tongues, and the nations of the world were impressed with its uniqueness and turned to Jerusalem to behold him who should meet its requirements. They said he who would do this must be of the tribe of Judah, of the house of David. Born of a virgin, born in Bethlehem,

born when the scepter was passing from Judah. That he would be called the Lord our righteousness, that the scepter of his kingdom would be a right scepter, that he would feed his flock like a shepherd, and gather the lambs in his arms and carry them in his bosom. That he would do no violence, nor would deceit be found in his mouth. That he would be oppressed and afflicted, and yet he would be as a lamb led to the slaughter and as a sheep before her shearers. That he would be sold for 30 pieces of silver, that he would be scourged, spit upon, nailed to the cross and yet not a bone of him broken. That vinegar and gall would be offered him while on the cross, that his garments would be divided among them and the lot would be cast for his vesture. That he would die for others and not for himself, that he would make his grave with the rich, and that he would rise on the third day. And all this that he might deliver the needy when he crieth, the poor, also, and him that hath no helper, that men might be blessed in him and all the nations call him blessed. This is but a mere outline of the picture. And yet it is enough to show that it is complete and perfect and that he who would meet its demands must have many characteristic and wonderful marks. How can we account for the construction of such a complete and perfect picture by a chain of artists stretched over a period of ten centuries and of different countries and who could not have had any consultation with each other? When an orchestra of 40 musicians, each playing his own special instrument, rendering each of them notes that are unlike those of any other player, yet the whole orchestra producing associate effects, whose distinction is their harmony and unity, we infer that somewhere some one mind has worked governingly upon the 40 musicians. When we see many masons engaged on a building, each covering a small space of the wall and the structure daily growing in their hands into a beautiful and perfect piece of architecture, it is an easy inference that one mind covers the entire plan which these work out in detail.

Now if the rendering of the orchestra presupposes one creative mind, or if the construction of the cathedral implies the working of a single genius, will not this picture of a personal-

ity, the grandest and sublimest that was ever conceived, require for its construction the presidency of a single mind, able to impress with its own thought and inspire with its own idea every workman that wrought on it. But whose was that mind? It certainly could not have been a finite mind, for no finite mind can tell of its own accord, even what a day may bring forth, let alone thousands of years. It must then have been the mind of the infinite God. We are, consequently, told that these men painted as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But whose picture are we told this was to be? Isaiah answers the question. (*Is. 9:6*) "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Hence the ideal of this picture is not to be a mere man, though the very best of men. He is to be to humanity a Son, who is to be, "The Mighty God."

Now in whom was this ideal realized? Why in Jesus of Nazareth, and in no other. But he is its perfect ideal. For if we take up the gospels which give a history of this Jesus of Nazareth we will find that every mark and shade of the picture drawn by the prophets is met in the description of the life of Jesus by the writers of these gospels. But some one may say, "That picture was drawn after the days of Jesus and was fitted to his history. Not so, for one of the Ptolemies of Egypt had these prophecies of which the picture is constructed translated from the Hebrew into the Greek a couple of centuries, at least, before the days of Jesus of Nazareth.

Talk about Mahomet, Zoroaster, Buddha, *et al.* having the same claim to divinity as Jesus of Nazareth, as a skeptic declared to me. It is not true. Where is the long line of prophecies concerning them? They could not say, as Jesus did to the Jews, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." These pretended saviours are entirely without this distinguishing characteristic.

2. He was a worker of most wonderful miracles. He turned the water into wine, hushed the winds and stilled the waves. He made the blind to see, the dumb to sing, and the lame man to

leap as an hart. He healed the palsied hand, cleansed the leper, drove out demons and raised the dead. And, as a crown of his mighty works, he burst the bands of death, came out of the grave, and ascended up on high, and now sitteth at the right hand of God. These wonderful works were the signs of his glory. They declared his perfect control of inanimate and of animate nature, and also of the realm of spirits. No mere man ever had such power. It is true that men have worked miracles, but they did it by the power of God. But this Jesus could say to the sick of the palsy, "Arise, take up thy bed and walk," or to the dead, "I say unto thee, Arise," or to the winds, "Peace be still," and they obeyed him. Now one who could thus, of his own accord; exercise divine power must have been divine. And consequently, these miracles, wrought by Jesus, were signs of his Messiahship. They prove him to be divine, to have almighty power. But I know that attempts have been made to divest these miracles wrought by Jesus of their special character, and to reduce them to the order of natural events. Some have attempted to remove them entirely from the sphere of actual fact, and ascribed them to legends elaborated out of Old Testament prophecies and types, (Strauss). Others have attributed them to the influence of religious feeling in the early church, (B. Baur). And still others to narratives of an allegorical character, (Volkmer). And yet others to psychical influences, especially those miracles which infer the healing of the sick and the expelling of demons, *i. e.* to the influence of one strong mind over a weak and unbalanced one, as seen in modern faith cures. Thus on physiological or psychological grounds, or on exegetical, allegorical and mythical principles, attempts have been made to get rid of the force of the miracles of Jesus. These attempts have been made because it has been assumed that miracles are impossible. It is said, "Every thing in the universe is under a system of natural laws. It is also said a miracle supposes a suspension of those laws, which is utterly impossible. But would a wise creator lock himself either out of or up with his creation, so that he could not act upon it and influence whenever he wills. Is it not reasonable that a wise creator is always just as directly active in nature as he was at its cre-

ation, although we can only detect his working by means of the law of cause and effect. And may it not be true that although, from their very nature, miracles transcend the ordinary law of cause and effect, yet they may not contradict it, inasmuch as nature may have been so ordered by divine wisdom as to admit higher and creative agencies into her sphere. May it not also be true that in God's great plan of the universe, no events natural or supernatural need to be excluded.

The miracles of Jesus do not, therefore, necessarily contradict or violate the laws of nature, but they may have been comprehended within the great system of natural law, the harmonious connection of which, in all of its parts, it is not for us to fathom. These miracles are, therefore, a "reflection in nature" of God's revelation of himself, something strictly in accord with law.

They are occasional manifestations of the complete introduction, through the God-man, of that relation between nature and spirit which is to be perfected in the end of the world.

Miracles, then, may be only links in that great chain of manifestations whose object it is to restore man to his lost communion with God, to impart to him a life, not derived from any created causality, but immediately from God.

But it is said again that when once the development of creation was completed, and the actual order of things definitely established, for the creator then to interfere with his work, as is implied in miracles, would be acknowledging his work incomplete and himself imperfect.

But it must be remembered that the culminating point in his creation was a free being. If this free being should move along as desired his interference would not be necessary, but if he should go in an opposite course, there would then certainly be an occasion for his interference. In this case the door would be open for God's intervention, even in the form of miracles, without any acknowledgment of imperfection. Now as to fact. How has man used his freedom? He has sinned, has transgressed God's law. How has God acted? He has interfered to save this creature by introducing his own Son into the flesh, which is the greatest of all miracles, the centre of all and from which all others radiate. Hence miracles are not necessarily a

suspension, nor a contradiction, of the laws of nature, but are simply a higher manifestation of the same power that is seen in natural laws.

Nor are they improper and inconsistent with the character of a perfect Creator, but owing to the fact that this free being has sinned, they are highly proper and a most glorious display of God's love.

Hence if neither impossible, nor improper, the question as to the reality of the miracles of Jesus becomes a mere question of history. Now this historical fact is as fully attested as any fact in history can possibly be. Hence I say, then, that Jesus of Nazareth is distinguished by a long series of most wonderful and glorious miracles. No other would-be savior can lay claim to anything like it. Mahomet did not even pretend to work miracles. That claim has been made for him by his disciples in later times.

3. Jesus had a superior, a divine wisdom.

His enemies said, "Whence has this man this wisdom, and these mighty works, having never learned." And those who were sent to arrest him and bring him before the Sanhedrim came back without him, saying, "Never man spake as this man." And on another occasion it was said, "He spake as one having authority and not as the scribes." Where in all the wisdom of the world can there be found anything to be compared with the Sermon on the Mount, with the parables, with the discourses at the Passover Supper, for beauty, for simplicity, for moral sentiment, for grandeur and sublimity of thought. "He quietly assumed to be competent to decide every question of truth and duty of himself, without any reference to any higher authority. He regarded the utterance, "I say unto you," as conclusive. Yet he was meek and lowly beyond all other men. He announced superior precepts of morals and religion. He manifested God to man, and man to himself, in a manner unlike any other teacher. He seized and held up to view the principal essence of virtue, viz. love, human and divine. He revealed the Fatherhood of God, and exalted it to the supreme height of adoption, whereby a vassal of Satan is transformed into the child of God. He traced human happiness from the broken cisterns

of earthly joy to its true source of communion with God. He bound mankind together, not merely in the unity of a common nature, but in the higher, closer union of his own mediation and redemption. He plucked from darkness the twin stars of Immortality and the Resurrection, and placing them in the galaxy of redemption, flooded with light the firmament of human hope."

In other words Jesus taught man the true conception of sin and also of the holiness of God, the loving Fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man, not merely by creation, but also by redemption. He also gave man a true conception of his immortal nature and showed him the way of eternal life.

The sublimest ideas the world has to-day are those revealed through Jesus. He is distinguished not merely by superior, but by divine wisdom. His enemies of old said, "Never man spake like this man." His modern critics call him the sublimest flower of humanity. Spinoza calls him the symbol of divine wisdom.

The Koran and the Vedas are not worthy to be compared with the sayings of Jesus.

4. Jesus had a sinless character.

He could turn on his enemies and say, "which of you convicteth me of sin?" "If I have spoken evil, bear testimony of that evil!" And we all know how completely their attempt to convict him of evil broke down at his trial before the High Priest and before the Roman governor. Three times did Pilate say, "I find no fault in him." So also said Herod. Every attempt to prove him at fault failed and at last, they had to fall back on the fact that he said "I am the Son of God."

What a wonderful impression the character of Jesus, as revealed in the gospels has made on the minds of some of the brightest geniuses of humanity!

It is well known what reverence is paid to him in passage after passage of Shakespeare, the greatest intellect in its wide and many-sided splendor. Men like Galileo, Kepler, Bacon, Newton, and Milton set the name of Jesus above every name. Kant and Jacobi hold him up as the symbol of ideal perfection,

and Schilling and Hegel as that of the union of the human and divine. Thomas Carlyle calls Jesus of Nazareth our divinest symbol! Higher has human thought not yet reached. Dr. Channing said, "The character of Jesus is wholly inexplicable on human principles. Matthias Claudius, one of the people's poets of Germany, wrote to a friend, saying of Jesus, "No one ever loved as he, nor did anything so truly great and good as the Bible tells of him ever enter into the heart of man. It is a holy form, which rises before the poor pilgrim like a star in the night, and satisfies his innermost cravings, his most secret yearnings and hopes." Rousseau in speaking of Jesus says, "Yes, if the death of Socrates be that of a sage, the life and death of Jesus are those of a god."

I might go on and quote passage after passage like these about the wonderful character of Jesus, many of them written too by men who did not look upon him as their Saviour. But these are enough to show that he was distinguished infinitely above all men for his most perfect character.

5. The effect of his kingdom in the earth, or the results of his life and teachings and death have been marvelous. Paul Richter says, as I have already quoted, "He lifted, with his pierced hands, empires off their hinges, and turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the ages."

Napoleon the First, said, "Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne and myself founded great empires; but upon what did the creation of our genius depend? Upon force. Jesus alone founded his empire upon love, and to this very day millions would die for him. Men wonder at the conquests of Alexander, but here is a conqueror who draws men to himself for their highest good; who unites to himself, incorporates into himself, not a nation, but the whole human race."

"This Jesus of Nazareth," says Dr. Schaff, "without money and arms, has conquered more millions than Alexander, Cæsar, Mohammed, and Napoleon. Without science and learning, he shed more light on things human and divine than all philosophers and scholars combined; without the eloquence of schools he spoke such words of life as were never spoken before nor since, and produced effects which lie beyond the reach of any

orator and poet; without writing a single line, he set more pens in motion, and furnished more themes for sermons, orations, discussions, works of learning and art, and sweet songs of praise, than the whole army of great men of ancient and modern times.

"There is a fifth gospel," says another, "which has been eighteen centuries in writing, viz., the work of Christ among mankind." The track of his footstep is seen wherever there has been any real progress in good, in love, in right, in the moral elevation of mankind. At the basis of our modern civilization lies the thought of Jesus. "Such was Jesus of Nazareth—a true man in body, soul, and spirit, yet differing from all men, a character absolutely unique and original, from tender childhood to ripe manhood moving in unbroken union with God, overflowing with the purest love to man, free from every sin and error, innocent and holy, teaching and practicing virtues in perfect harmony, devoted solely and uniformly to the noblest ends, sealing the purest life with the sublimest death, and ever acknowledged since as the one and only model of goodness and holiness! All human greatness loses on closer inspection; but his character grows more and more pure, sacred and lovely, the better we know it."

All hail the power of Jesus' name!
Let angels prostrate fall!
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown him Lord of all!

Let every kindred, every tribe,
On this terrestrial ball,
To him all majesty ascribe
And crown him Lord of all.

ARTICLE V.

FAMILY WORSHIP.

By REV. E. D. WEIGLE, A. M., Altoona, Pa.

There are but three divine institutions, the family, the Church, the state. The family lies at the foundation of the Church, and the Church, the brotherhood of believers, or, what is equivalent, an aggregate of Christian families, gives moral tone to the state. The power of the Church and the welfare of the state are closely linked to, and dependent upon, the Christian character of the family. The latter sustains to the former the relation of cause and effect. Whatever, therefore, abridges the moral energy of the family curtails the efficiency of the Church and the elevating influence of the state.

That the practice of family religion has been much neglected admits of no argument. The fact of the need of family religion granted, the duty of Family Worship follows as a matter of course. The more comprehensive duty includes the less, as the presence of the genus embraces the species. Family Worship is only one element or form of family religion, but it is so central, so essential, so vital to the maintenance of piety in the home that it may well be made a separate topic for meditation and discussion.

There is ground for the belief that the beautiful custom of keeping the fire of devotion buring on the altar of the home, by daily religious service—the Hausgottesdienst of our early German forefathers, has become, in a measure, obsolete. We are living in an age when material things so engross the mind, and so occupy the time, that but little opportunity is given for meditation and devotion within the bosom of the family. The gods of this world have invaded the sacred precincts of home, and, after the destruction of Jehovah's altar, have upon its ruins, erected their own.

Ours is an age, moreover, when undue stress is laid on the value of mass-meeting religion. It is comparatively an easy

thing to induce the populace to congregate, *en masse*, in summer or winter, in God's house, or in the woods, to listen to some noted divine, or famous evangelist, to join in song and prayer with the multitude, to cry *hosanna* with the excited crowd, but it is rather difficult to convince men that it is just as pleasing to God, and even more important, that they should conduct their families, and order their private lives, in harmony with domestic piety, and upon the basis of personal and daily devotion to God. This is true, not only of the avowedly indifferent in regard to sacred things, but of many who profess faith in Christ, announce themselves as having attained a high state of consecration, and lay claims to a regard for consistency of life. We have it from good authority, that of the personal knowledge of a brother in the sacred calling, that not a few men in the ministry, either entirely neglect Family Worship, or attend to it in a merely perfunctory manner.

We speak advisedly when we aver that there are those among our laity, who pass before the Church and the world as earnestly Christian and zealously active, who have not the semblance of religion in the family, to say nothing of regular worship. No pastor can carefully study his people,—the human side of his work—especially if his field be a city pastorate, without being made cognizant of the fact that many of the families are in an anomalous and sad condition. It is simply a fact that the young, particularly the male portion, are not being held to the Church. Into many homes the pastor comes, where the father and mother still cling to an early implanted faith in Christ and his Church, but the children, where are they? They have left the Sunday School; into the catechetical class they will not come; in a word they are lost to the Church, and that means, lost to their parents, to themselves and to God. Making due allowance for the maliform temptations and allurements which beset the youth of today, does it not seem as though there were something radically wrong in the piety and the discipline of the home. Certainly family religion cannot be a positive force a winning power and a healthful inspiration when the children thus slip out of the domain of parental control into the midst of the potencies of evil, as incarnate in a wicked world?

We are approaching a crisis politically, socially, religiously, the issue of which no one can forecast, unless there be an examination of the condition of our homes, and a return to domestic piety, whose central elements are Christian nurture and true devotion. The sanctity of the Christian Sabbath, the maintenance of good government and the success of the Church would not be imperiled to-day, if the torch of Christian knowledge were lighted in and the fire of true devotion burned on the altar of every family in our fair land. The great need of the hour is the church in the house.

Reasons for, or, at least, explanations of, this condition of the Christian life of to-day are not difficult to find. We are living in a rushing age. Men are too busy to turn aside for a few moments to meet God in the closet. True we have the command, promise and example of Christ to incite us to such prayer,

“Cold mountains and the midnight air
Witnessed the fervor of his prayer,”

but he lived almost nineteen hundred years ago. Men are too busy to gather around them their children, and give them the benefit of God's word and prayer, yet the best of men have left on record the fact that the busiest days required the most of prayer.

Then, too, the multiplication of agencies and instrumentalities in the church,—the Sunday school, the various missionary and benevolent organizations, together with its devotional meetings,—have led some to conclude that these may be made a substitute for the church in the house. But we affirm, without fear of thoughtful contradiction, that in proportion as the multiplication of even well-meant religious exercises has led to a loss or relaxation of fatherly and motherly power in the conduct of religion in the family, in like proportion has the cause of true Christianity suffered. There are persons who can and do exhort in public, and who lead assemblies in prayer, but never accord the wives of their bosom the benefit of Christian counsel, nor the children a word of prayer. It is a question whether a man who has no closet, and no family altar should speak or pray, in the name of Christ, in public. We may freely say he ought not exhort and lead in prayer others when a lack of the performance of

similar duties towards his own family, brands him as being a denier of the faith and worse than an infidel.*

I. ARGUMENTS FOR FAMILY WORSHIP.

1. *The place the family occupies in the divine economy, and the whole tenor of Scripture respecting family religion afford an argument for Family Worship.* The family is as truly a divine institution as the Church ; and the Church itself is but an extension of the family idea. The Christian Church is a larger household, a wider brotherhood, a perpetually expanding body of families united in Christ, the head. The family was before the Church ; the latter grew out of the family. The kingdom of Christ originated, was nurtured in, and came forth from, a family. Christ forever sanctified family religion by his own life and example. What a love and reverence for the family relationship he ever showed, even on the cross, in the loving provision he made for his heart-pierced mother. An old English divine has well observed " that a family is a small diocese in which the first essays are made of the episcopal and ecclesiastical zeal, piety and prudence." If this is the place the family occupies in the divine economy, then the duty of worship in the same is placed among the axiomatic truths of moral obligation.

Worship, in relation to the Christian Sabbath, has been defined to be "communion with God, peace through God, harmony with God, and rest in God," and surely these blessed realities need to be kept up in our hearts and lives daily. The entire life of the Christian family is a continuous act of worship in the more extended sense of the word, and must gradually become more so, since all its actions are done in the name of Christ and for the glory of God. This thoroughly Christian conduct is, however, sustained and strengthened by Family Worship in

*The writer knows a boastful self-righteous and egotistic man, who speaks of the Sunday morning prayer-meeting, where he gives himself a religious airing in exhortation and prayer, as the place in which he gets his spiritual breakfast. The fact that not one of a large family is in the church indicates that he goes away from home to get and to give his nourishment. It were better in every way, if he were first to feast himself and his family at home, at the domestic altar.

the proper sense, in which the family as such, seeks for special strength in the word and the spirit of God.

Whilst there is no absolute command for Family Worship, in Gods word, the whole tenor of Scripture is such as, taken in conjunction with the family's place in the divine economy, the absence of such command does not invalidate Family Worship but rather places it among the things to be inferred from the general teachings of the Scriptures. Just as a book may be in the hightest sense Christian without using the formulas of religion and Christianity, so the Bible teaches many things not clearly expressed in positive commands. The bottom of the ocean is always presupposed as existent though it be neither visible nor alluded to. The name of God is not mentioned in the book of Esther, but who does not read God's purpose all through it. An over-ruling Providence is discoverable on every page. The name of God does not appear in our national constitution, but who can read it without detecting the Christian accent in its every provision. The absence of a positive command, enjoining Family Worship as such, makes the argument for it, the duty of family religion being admitted, the more potent.

The priority of the family as a divine institution conceded, the fact of worship in the same established, not the continuance but the transference of such worship from the family into the Church, and to be conducted there only, are matters which would call for a positive, divine command. But there is none. On the other hand, there are numerous hints and allusions in the Scriptures which go to show that Family Worship was a form of devotion which was observed and enjoyed divine sanction. The priestly idea which now obtains in some Protestant churches, that the sanctuary is the only place where acceptable worship may be rendered is subversive of the divine order, will undermine the very foundation of the Christian home, and will cause a cold, formal emptiness to afflict the Church; for the warmth and power of devotion in God's house are conditioned by the spirituality of the closet and the family.

As a supplement to the thought under consideration, we may refer to the *practice of the ancient saints*. The altars of Abraham, dotting the pathway of his pilgrimage, may be looked upon

as so many family altars. God said "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment." From which we gather that he not only prayed with his family, but taught them, aye, commanded them, and was prophet and king, as well as priest in his own house. David, after the ark, which had been too long out of its divinely appointed place, had been returned to the Tabernacle, a public service of thanksgiving having been engaged in returned to bless his household, emphasizing the fact that ministers of religion must not think that their public performances will excuse them from Family Worship. The ark of God, in the house of Obededom, understood and appreciated, made itself felt in blessings abundant, in the short period of three months. Solomon's precept and promise touching youthful training, Job's burnt-offerings with his family at early dawn, Joshua's resolution respecting the Lord's service by himself and his house, the prophecy of the Lord's fury upon those families who call not on God's name, Paul's injunction that children should be nurtured in the chastening and the admonition of the Lord, and the answer which came to the prayers and alms of a devout heathen, who feared God with all his house, indicate the tenor of the Scriptures respecting religion in the family.

2. A second argument for Family Worship is found in the natural (*enforced by the covenant*) relationship of parents and children. Natural instinct, to say nothing of reason and grace, impels to the care of offspring. Within the domain of the rational creation absolute obedience to parental authority must find a basis in obedience to God, whose source is love to God. And the child learns obedience or disobedience to God from the parent, because it has no other teacher or model. Desirous as the parent may be to lead its affections up, at once, to the Creator, the previous stages of the path must first be passed through. For a while the maternal care is the only providence it knows; and the father's experience is to it a world of grand enterprise and of power unlimited. The sphere of thought and endeavor is bounded by the circumference of home influence.

In this natural relationship the parents, by daily contact of life reproduce themselves in their children ; hence it becomes a matter of vital importance that the parents be such in life, in character, in conduct, in example and influence as that the product may be a comfort to the former and a beatitude to the latter. In thus speaking a complete family, where there is not only a husband and a wife, but children as well, is had in mind. For the child to see its parents bend in worship and to hear them speak, with holy reverence, of their Father in heaven, is in itself solemn and suggestive, and such daily communication with the unseen but gracious God becomes a real ladder set up from earth to heaven. In vain the child strives to climb the height of the parent's knowledge (his virtual omniscience), nor can he conceive of a diviner guarantee than a father's promise, and, if the parent be truly Christian, and conscientiously faithful, if the home influence be positively religious, no after years of wandering from God can entirely efface these early impressions. Though a companion of the prodigal in feeding swine, the day will arrive, when coming to himself, he will arise and return perhaps not to his earthly yet to his heavenly Father. When the bones of faithful parents are mouldering to dust, some thought, touched by the breath of Jehovah, may recall the days of early Christian training and holy influence, and result in the salvation of him who has long been dishonoring his better days of home piety.

And if the natural relationship, in which we stand toward our children call for the utmost care of their bodily interests and welfare, should not the same relationship appeal to us mightily to make their spiritual interests a matter of chief concern. Surely if the soul is of more importance than the body, the life to be than the present, heaven than hell, then we ought to give our children the benefit of our best endeavors in the line of spiritual advantage and improvement. All this is really implied and assumed, when the marriage covenant is entered into and publicly ratified.

But the covenant relationship in which Christian parents stand greatly enforces the obligations which grow out of the natural relationship. Christian parents, who have done all for their chil-

dren that they could do in their earliest days—having consecrated them to God in holy baptism, have thereby entered into a solemn agreement with God to do their utmost, by precept and example, by a consecrated life and its influence, to nurture their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord, and fidelity to this agreement demands family piety. It is a mystery to us that parents present their children for baptism, and agree to renounce the world, the flesh and the devil, confess their faith in the Holy Trinity, as expressed in the Apostles' Creed, promise that this renunciation of sin and this confession of faith, made in the child's name should be actualized in a life of nurture by them, and a life of faith by the child, and then turn away from God's altar, glad that the child has a name, without a serious thought thereafter of the awful obligations assumed. This is a practical view of baptism, of covenant relationship, only too prevalent in the churches. The Scriptural idea of the establishment, between God and man, of a gracious relationship, which extends to us and our children, is lost sight of. The covenant into which we enter by baptism is everlasting so far as God is concerned, and the realization of its provisions are conditioned upon fidelity on our part. The covenant of God with man, which is nothing more nor less than a conditional promise, is never broken from the divine side.* Said one, who does not believe in infant membership, on receiving information from a Christian parent that he proposed to have his child dedicated to God in this manner, "It does seem strange that a little water on that child's head should benefit it, when it knows nothing about it." The quick response which came to that Christian father, in the moment of need, was, "That child would not get very far in the world, if its parents were to defer bodily care of it, until it might know what it meant. And surely we ought to do for it spiritually what we can, and all we know to do now, is to bring it to Christ, and give it the benefit of baptismal grace." Jairus' daughters would never have been given back to her bereft parents, had the father assumed that he could do nothing for his dying child. The great

*To be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, signifies a profound and everlasting consecration to God." (*Pastoral Theology*, Dr. Hoppin, p. 364).

faith of the heathen centurion in behalf of his afflicted servant, is a rebuke to Christian parents who have not faith enough to consecrate their children to God. Christ, time and again, honored intercessory faith, especially in the person of a parent on behalf of a child.

In our reaction from the *opus operatum* of baptismal regeneration, we must not go to the other extreme of making the sacred ordinance a mere empty, meaningless form. If this covenant relationship does not bring great blessing to our homes, it is not because of the lack of grace from the divine, but for the want of fidelity to the covenant from the human side. No home without true piety in the parents and constant nurture of the children in that which their baptism signifies, should find fault with this ordinance, if the family does not rest under the unfolding grace of God, and the blooming and fructifying influences of true godliness.

Is it a wonder that much of our professed Christian family life is as barren of gracious fruit, as the Sahara desert? In many of them there is nothing distinctively religious—no Bible read, no Scripture memorized, no praise to Jehovah, no altar of devotion, in a word, no God. Ah! there must be a restoration of family piety as embodied in patriarchal nurture and family altars if our children are to be saved, if the Church is to succeed in its conflict with sin, if the world is to be conquered for Christ.

3. A third argument is *in the fact that the salvation of our children, as a rule, is conditioned by the Christian atmosphere of the home.* That there are exceptions to this rule is freely admitted. Some very pious children have come from ungodly homes, and some very impious ones from Christian families; the former are Christian despite parental wickedness and through the help of outside influence; the latter are sinners in the face of holy home influence, a depraved heart and unrighteous associations having completely neutralized well-meant and well-directed parental nurture. A blameless Samuel had degenerate sons. But as a rule, Solomon's precept: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it," heeded, has for its reward children, either consecrate from childhood, or brought to a saving knowledge of the truth

in after years because the incorruptible seed of divine truth which liveth and abideth forever was early implanted. It has often been asserted by persons who have not examined the facts, that ministers' children are especially characterized by moral obliquity, but the facts show the assertion utterly false. A larger proportion of ministers' children honor the blessedness and respond to the force of religious influence and example than those of any other class of persons.

It is simply a fact that the impressions which cannot fade from memory, the influences which determine character, the training which conditions the after life, the religious convictions which give direction to the Christian life are present to the child-life, and obtain a degree of fixedness before the child places a decade of years behind it. This being the case, what momentous issues hang suspended upon these early years of life. How important it is that these tender plants grow in the right kind of soil, enjoy a healthful atmosphere, and drink in the light of a transforming Christian influence in the home. That Roman Catholic writer who observed: "Give me the children until they are seven years old, and then you Protestants may have them," knew what he was saying. The mother has a work to do in the salvation of her children, which she dare delegate to no one else. The father, as priest of the home, has a service to render his children no one else can render. A father whose children have nearly all gone astray, lamented the sad fact, but then they are only true to the home teaching and the parental influence. There is no God recognized in that home, or to be accurate, gods other than the true God, and the children, in harmony with a universal principle, are becoming like the gods they worship. A family where once daily devotion was the joy of the home, allowed the domestic altar to be broken down, and untold sorrow has come to that household, because of the moral degradation of the children. Whatsoever we sow that shall we also reap in the conduct of our families as in other things.

It is, however, but just to observe in this connection that there are homes where the study of the Bible has always been a necessity, where the fire of devotion ever glowed upon the altar, where the influence was positively religious, and where the chil-

dren were taught the worship of God with the first accents of intelligent speech, but from which came children, who, for the time, were utterly untrue to their early training. Augustine was such a son, and the pastor with difficulty assured his pious mother that a child of so many prayers and tears, of such maternal solicitude and influence, would not be lost, and the Christian world knows what he became under the grace of God, in vindication of early home training.

Religious nurture in the family will attain its purpose sooner or later; it may be after the parents, whose well-meant efforts were disregarded, are removed by death. Irenaeus Prime, in one of his letters in the *New York Observer*, records a notable instance of the post-humous influence of a pious mother upon a skeptical son. This young man was a class-mate, but a notorious infidel, and tried, as is always the case with such fellows, to convert everybody to his way of thinking. After his graduation he became a lawyer. For many years Mr. Prime had known nothing of him. But as he was traveling in Syria, in the year 1854, he found this class-mate, in this far away country, teaching the Christian religion to humble Arabs. Of course, Mr. Prime was surprised and rejoiced to see him in such praiseworthy service, a devout disciple of that Christ whom he formerly reviled. He at once inquired what had happened that such a change had come over his views. The story was soon told. He had had a pious mother, whose counsels and prayers and tears he disregarded while she lived, but the memory of whose life, at her death, brought conviction to his heart, so that he had to yield to the claims of that Saviour whom his mother had so long served. To make amends, in a measure, for the injury he had done the Master and his cause, by his open wickedness and avowed skepticism, he at once, consecrated the remainder of his life to missionary work.

Faithful training and constant religious influence in the family may not result in the immediate salvation of our children, but God will take care of it, and will make it effective in his own way and time. We are not held responsible for results, but for fidelity, and inasmuch as our days of youth are lived over again in old age—the period of second childhood—what we were

and did then will come back to us again. As was the ascending, so, in all probability, will be the setting sun of life.

4. A fourth argument for Family Worship is found in the fact that *the welfare of the family, the success of the Church and the perpetuity of the nation depend upon religion in the home.* As religion is minimized in the home, every undermining force becomes maximized. As the fire of devotion ceases to burn on our home altars, the Church will witness depleted prayer-meetings, inactivity in every department of church work, and the faithful minister will find himself in the presence of a multitude of religious icebergs on the Lord's day. As the name and reality of home with its Abrahams and Hannahs, who cease not to command their children after them, in consecration to God from the womb, fall out of the nation's vocabulary, in that proportion will anarchy and lawlessness prevail. The saloon influence in politics, threatening the stability of our government, the personal liberty sentiments assailing the Christian Sabbath, the blatant infidelity, transplanted from other shores, attacking the Church of Christ, are at one in undermining the Christian home. Not one of the seven atheistic anarchists of Hay-market notoriety, whose sad end is still fresh in memory, enjoyed the sheltering power and uplifting devotion of the Christian home. The hope of the nation, of society, of the Church, must be sought in the family, enlightened by the truth of God, pavilioned by the omnipresent care of our heavenly father, and nurtured by the counsels, the prayers, the tears and the undying influence of consecrated fathers and mothers.

Napoleon, the First, whilst he paid a heartfelt tribute to his mother, also uttered a world-wide truth, when he said: "France needs mothers." It is said that Carlyle who once told Irving that he did not believe in the Christian religion was so influenced by his Christian mother that he, on a certain occasion, acknowledged that her religion was essentially his religion. Neither the Church nor the state can long prosper without the power of the family altar and the conserving force of domestic piety. It is a matter for which a Christian people should not cease to thank God that the home of the chief magistrate of this nation enjoys the blessings and the hallowing influence of the family altar.

The decay of family life, especially in our larger cities, is a matter which may well engage the attention of the thoughtful. Business and pleasure, religion and charity in their organized workings, so engross the time and interest of families, that the proper cultivation of family life is neglected. Our Sundays in all our cities are so occupied as to leave little or no time for spiritual improvement and devotion in the family. And yet it must be admitted that meetings for prayer and praise, for the Sunday School and missions and for other religious purposes become hollow things, if not the out-growth of a healthy home piety, with its kindly duties of filial affection and domestic joys. The organizations of charity, of temperance reform and of other humane interests, are a recognition of the decay of family piety, the consequent impotence of the Church and the nation's peril. In Philadelphia the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union has opened a room for boys and nearly one hundred and fifty are now under its care who, but for its efforts, would be on the streets, or in the saloons and other dens of vice. But how much better it would be for these boys to be in Christian homes. In our smaller towns many of the children are educated on the streets and graduated in evil from the saloon.

The only hope of the Church, and the only safety of the nation lie in fathers of Abrahamic character, in mothers of Hannah's devotion, in the restoration of God's altar in the home. We must come back to first principles, to the elementary matters of faith and practice. We must lay the foundation broad and deep, if the super-structure is to withstand the storms of skepticism, the floods of vice, and the demoralizing tendencies of an age not given to godly fear nor overmuch reverence.

II. THE DUTY OF FAMILY WORSHIP IN THE LIGHT OF A GLORIOUS PRIVILEGE.

To say nothing of the excuses offered for its neglect, among which are such as these, want of time, deficiency in gifts and a lack of courage, a refutation of whose emptiness we will not attempt in this discussion, we do yet wish to hold to view this precious Christian service in the home in the light of a privilege all radiant with blessings. There are two kinds of Family

Worship ; the one kind is mere observance, the other is the open state of prayer and communion with God. The former is always a duty, irksome, mechanical, formal ; the latter is a privilege, joyous, natural, spiritual, inspiring. Family Worship is sometimes made a substitute for closet prayer. This should never be. Better have Family Worship but once a day, than that any member should neglect the divinely commanded, and the rich in blessing, duty of closet prayer. The father who has no closet is not fit to conduct worship in the family. Says another : "This service (Family Worship) is often made an *opus operatum*, which infringes upon the duty of closet prayer—the unseen intercourse with God, which is the very breath of the Christian life, and without which all other devotions become hollow and empty hypocrisy." We venture the declaration that the true reason,—excuses are not reasons,—why so many professed Christians have no worship in the family is that with them it would be the mere observance of a duty, because of mammon worship, of a lack of consecration and of a want of a true conception of what fatherhood and motherhood involve. No church in the house makes a lean family spiritually. How far would a family get in temporal things with one or two meals a week. This is all some professed Christians get of spiritual food. They are so dyspeptic that they cannot endure two meals—two services on the same Lord's day, and, as for the prayer-meeting they have neither the time, nor the disposition to partake of this repast in the middle of the week. The Christian, who would develop a vigorous spiritual life, must come to realize that there are laws governing the soul life, and one of these is the necessity of daily spiritual food and heavenly companionship.

To fully realize the privilege side of Family Worship, three things, at least, are necessary :

1. Our prayers must be real prayers.
2. There must be harmony of prayer between husband and wife and children.
3. The life must be in accord with the prayers.

Where these things obtain in the home there Family Worship is as little a duty as eating when hungry, drinking when thirsty,

and resting when tired. There is a constrained Christianity which is not so because of the constraining power of the love of Christ. Too many of our religious exercises are engaged in on the cold bath principle. People use the cold bath, not for pleasure, but of necessity and their health ; they go in with reluctance, and are glad when they get out ; but religion with all its ordinances, to a true believer, is like water to a fish ; it is his element ; he lives in it and could not live out of it.

It is a sad omen when professed Christians engage in their religious exercises as they would take an unpleasant medicine. The true Christian would be a man of prayer, a worker in the church, a priest in his family, apart from any considerations of rewards and punishments, because it is a blessed thing to live now in a state of sweet and precious communion with God. It is a mistake to speak of church attendance, of the prayer-meeting service, of Sunday-school work, of Family Worship, of closet devotion, of the whole round of Christian exercises evermore as duties. What would one think of a friend who being invited to sit down to a feast prepared especially for him, if he were to say : I guess I must accept the invitation, and obey the summons, for it is a duty which I must meet." Such conduct would outrage every refined instinct of one's nature and would be a breach of every social law. And yet we speak about meeting our creator, redeemer, and bountiful benefactor, in the sanctuary, around our home altars, in the closet, as a duty we must not neglect. It speaks of a low conception of our privileges in Christ Jesus, of a lack of spiritual understanding and appreciation to be ever speaking of duty in religion. Family Worship wants to be lifted out of the narrow sphere of duty into that of privilege, to bless the home, to honor God, and to save those in whose interests it is maintained.

It is freely admitted that there is often the form of Family Worship, where there is no family piety ; where the life of the family makes worship therein a burlesque on religion. But where there is true piety in the home, there will be worship. Family altars, if the fire of devotion truly burns thereon, are the expression of that which obtains in the heart, the warmth of di-

vine love, the light of the eternal Spirit, and the communion of the human soul with gracious and reconciled deity.

May God grant that the time may soon come, when such entire consecration shall possess the individual heart, the home, the Church and the world as that all Christian exercises shall be lifted from the low plain of duty, to the high ground of privilege, where the rays of the Sun of Righteousness, and the genial atmosphere of heavenly communion, shall cause to bloom and become fruitful, in every relation of life, every natural and gracious power of the soul. When that day shall have come, the ultimate purpose of Christ's kingdom will have been realized—universal dominion.

ARTICLE VI.

THE WONDERS OF PROVIDENCE IN THE LIGHT OF THE SCRIPTURES.

By REV. G. C. H. HASSEKARL, Syracuse, N. Y.

Providence may be defined as the care which God exercises over all worlds, and all creatures in the worlds, in upholding them in existence, in directing and controlling the circumstances on which their continued existence depends, and in providing food and all other supplies which the wants of every living creature constantly demand.

In order that we may at once see the connection and relation in which our subject stands to the other great questions which have confronted mankind from the earliest times, we here give the following analysis:

I. CREATION.

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|----|------------|----|---------|----|--------------------|----|--------------|----|--------------------|----|------------------------|----|------------------------|----|--------------------|----|-------------|----|-------------|
| 1. Creation in general. | 1. Fact of—proof of—difficulty of conceiving of.
2. The end of.
3. The destiny of. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Cosmogony..... | 1. Scriptural account.
2. The Hexamemon—or 6 day theory. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Creation of Man... | Physical. <table border="0" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">1.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Origin of.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">2.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Age of.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">3.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Unity of the Race.</td> </tr> </table> Unity of the Race. <table border="0" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">1.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">One species.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">2.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Same moral nature.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">3.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Ethnological question.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">4.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Philological argument.</td> </tr> </table>
Psychological. <table border="0" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">1.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Existence of soul.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">2.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Its origin.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-right: 10px;">3.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Trichotomy.</td> </tr> </table> | 1. | Origin of. | 2. | Age of. | 3. | Unity of the Race. | 1. | One species. | 2. | Same moral nature. | 3. | Ethnological question. | 4. | Philological argument. | 1. | Existence of soul. | 2. | Its origin. | 3. | Trichotomy. |
| 1. | Origin of. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Age of. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Unity of the Race. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | One species. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Same moral nature. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Ethnological question. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Philological argument. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Existence of soul. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Its origin. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Trichotomy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

II. PROVIDENCE.

1. Nature of Providence.	1. Preservation.	1. Pantheistic. with the world.	1. Mechanical. Pre-established harmony.
	2. Government.	1. Forms of theistic conception. 2. Reasons for believing in second causes.	2. Concensus. 3. Mind the only agent. 4. Second causes.
2. Spheres of Providence.	1. Material Order.	1. Ordinary Providence. 2. Extraordinary Providence.	1. Unvitalized Matter. Miracles, with all its connates.
	2. Moral Order.	1. Non-human. Angels. 2. Human.	1. Good and Bad. 2. Uncovenanted relations. 3. Economy of the Covenants.

We now need hardly be told that this providential care is general, and it is particular: it is universal and it is unremitting. Four arguments are adduced in favor of this proposition: 1. The direct argument of the Scriptures which teach the doctrine; 2. The argument suggested by the natural dictates of reason; 3. The argument founded on a consideration of the wisdom of God; 4. The argument on a consideration of the love of God. In the effort to illustrate this doctrine, we shall necessarily touch a chord that will awaken responsive echoes in every Christian heart; but at the same time, we know that we shall come in collision with the sentiments of those who, for the want of the proper insight and light, do not recognize any Providence, or any care of God in controlling the affairs of the world, or any of the helpless creatures adhering to its surface. In thus ignoring the existence of a personal God, they are obliged to say, that all things are under the dominion of chance, or that there is a blind force in nature that compels or necessitates the succession of things, so that they must be as they are, and cannot be otherwise; and that there can be no variation from this fixed and eternal order of nature. On this theory, the very idea of prayer would be absurd. For why should one pray to nature, or how could he expect by his prayer to arrest the order of nature, or to effect a change in the necessary succession of events?

All such impose on themselves, and try to deceive others by the use of words which are mere sounds without ideas or significance. What do they mean when they talk about nature, or eternal laws of nature? Is nature a divinity? Or did nature construct the forms of the universe? What is nature but the

temple of the universal Architect? But it is certain, no temple ever built itself. No, they impose on themselves by the use of a word, as if nature were endowed with intelligence and power, and so they really worship nature in the place of God. Their aim is to free themselves from the idea of a personal God, and thereby at the same time, from the sense of personal responsibility. It is for this reason they substitute a mere word without meaning in the place of God.

But they have to admit that there are laws in existence—wise fixed, and changeless laws. And if nature did not ordain these laws, God must have ordained them.

But now let us as briefly as may be consistent with the importance of the subject, consider the first of the four arguments stated, in favor of the doctrine of Providence, viz., viewing it in the light of the Scriptures.

I. The Scriptures in simple, plain, and direct terms teach it. In the statement of this argument we find it no easy matter to make a proper selection of the passages on which we rely, on account of the superabundance of texts which clearly and explicitly state the doctrine.

But first of all we will learn from the Teacher of teachers. It was Jesus who said: "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap nor gather into barns, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought, can add one cubit to his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet, I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore, take no thought, saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye first

the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." * * "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are numbered. Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows."

These words are simply wonderful. And to believe them would require more faith than any of us possess, if they had not been spoken by the Son of God, and if the truth of them had not been sealed on our hearts by the Spirit of God. Implicit faith in these divine words implies something more than an ordinary belief. Here we are taught that it is God the heavenly Father who clothes the grass of the field, who paints and beautifies the lilies and all the flowers of the field, who feedeth the little sparrow, and also hath numbered all the hairs of our heads. And then he rebukes our want of faith by asking, "Are ye not of much more value than many sparrows," and "Will he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Then there is the absolute, unconditional promise, "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things," and if ye seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, "All these things shall be added unto you." What stronger support for his faith does any child of God need than this assurance from the very lips of the Son of God?

But who believes in the literal truth of the declaration that the very hairs of his head are all numbered? And yet would this be impossible with God? He who created all things shall he not know how, and why, and for what he created them, and thus also know the number of hairs on our heads? He who has viewed through a microscopic lens one of the hairs of his head, and knows that there are four rows of brilliant and sparkling diamonds in every hair, and that these diamonds set on every human brow are numbered by the thousands, may not feel surprised that he who made them, must certainly also know the number of them.

And if God hath numbered the hairs of our heads, much more may we believe that he hath numbered our days, and possibly all the steps that we take in life, even from the cradle to the

grave, and all the events that make up the whole history of our lives, and even all the minute incidents and circumstances that fill up the intervals of every year, and every hour of our earthly existence as free-willed beings. "Such knowledge is high, who can attain unto it?" This was the exclamation of the devout Psalmist. Let us quote his words more at length: "O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my down sitting, and mine uprising; thou understandest my thoughts afar off. Thou compassest my path, and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo! O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Thou hast beset me behind and before, and hast laid thine hand upon me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me! it is high, I cannot attain unto it!"

This is something almost past our comprehension, that the Lord knows our thoughts—afar off even before they exist in our minds, and every word in our tongue even before it has been uttered. But this is not all. The inspired Psalmist goes on: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me. If I say surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee, but the night shineth as the day. The darkness and the light are both alike to thee. For thou hast possessed my reins, thou hast covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret and curiously wrought in the lowest part of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance being yet unperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

We are thankful for these words, for in them we can say with confidence is summed up all that can be known of the science of biology. The pen of inspiration carries us back to the beginning and the origin of all life. It reads very much as if it

were intended to teach that the germ of every life was created with the first man. Is that inconceivable? What is a germ? Who knows? It is possible that ten million germs might be held on the point of a needle. And the whole race was thus created in Adam. The Psalmist speaks of his substance, when he was made in secret; and of his numbers, that they were written in God's book, and fashioned in continuance, when as yet there was none of them.

And what God did for one, he must have done for every individual of the race. Not only physically, but we know he did it spiritually in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, the second Adam. And if they were germs of an immortal life, could they not have lived from the beginning? Particularly when we know that even the germs of vegetable life have been preserved in the embryo state, and then been planted, and afterward have sprung up into beautiful and fresh forms of vegetable life, after having been in a dormant state for more than three thousand years.*

But, again we ask, what is a germ? Who can tell? We put a seed into the ground and it seems to die—the whole seed seems to decay and perish;* and yet, there are life-giving principles in it, from which a plant is grown that will grow a stalk or body containing other seeds of the same kind. The germs of all were contained in that seed that perished in the earth. Then what is the germ? It is a power—an invisible, indivisible, and inconceivable creative fiat from God too minute for our modern scientist to take cognizance of with his microscopic lens. In a word, God's work here and everywhere is like himself; it is beyond finding out,—the finite can never grasp the infinite, otherwise both would be equals. "If from a single Paramecium no less than two hundred and sixty-eight millions of organisms are produced in one month; if from the germs contained in the seed of a thistle, a stalk is grown that produces twenty-four thousand seeds in one season; if from the germs contained in a single grain of maize, or Indian corn, sufficient can be raised in five years to plant a hill of corn with three grains on every square yard of dry land upon the face of the globe; and if in ten years, a suf-

**Evolution as taught in the Bible*, by the author, pp, 10, 40, &c.

ficient quantity, to plant the whole solar system (as far as we know it), in the same manner; why, we would ask, is it not credible and consistent that God created also in germ that ancestral life-tree of which mankind is the out-growth;—of which Adam is the root, of which Eve is the trunk, the races the limbs, the nations the branches, the families the twigs, and the individuals the foliage."* Therefore, however great the mystery involved, it is not incredible that what the Psalmist meant was, that the substance of every human being was contained in the loins of the first man Adam; "like Levi, the great grandson of Abraham, is represented by St. Paul as paying tithes to Melchisedec, while he, the remote descendant to be born two hundred and forty-six years later, was yet in the loins of Abraham."*

The universality of the dispensation of providence is learned from many other passages of Holy Writ. Take Isaiah, xlvi. 1-7. : "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: And I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. I am the Lord and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me; that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things."

This record carries with it the weight of its own evidence. It is not possible to believe that it was made by an uninspired man. The fact can be as well established by historic proof as any other fact of history, that the record was written long before any of

**Evolution as taught in the Bible*, pp. 41, 42, 43.

the events spoken of had transpired. Cyrus was not yet born nor named. The holy city had not yet been made desolate, and the inhabitants had not been carried away to Babylon as captives. But yet Cyrus is the promised deliverer, who was to say to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid.

Look at the minuteness of the details contained in this prediction. There had been no city like Babylon. It never had been taken. It was as impregnable as the tower of Babel, some of whose builders and children were the founders of Babylon. Nebuchadnezzar spent twenty years and employed two million men in building the temple, the palaces, the hanging gardens, and the walls of that city. Yet the prophet, looking more than two hundred years into the future, sees the man, and calls him by name, who was to take the greatest and mightiest city of antiquity,—“the hammer of the whole earth, by which nations were broken in pieces, and kingdoms destroyed,”—to destroy its wall which was thirty-four miles long, between two and three hundred feet in height and about fifty feet at the top, and to open the hundred brazen gates which enclosed it on every side. The prophet also shows how this was to be done—“that saith to the deep, be dry, and I will dry up the rivers”—Euphrates and Tigris. The Euphrates ran under the arched walls, and through the midst of that city. And since there was no way to take the city, or to enter through its walls, but to turn the course of the river around the walls, by digging a new channel for the water, and entering the city by the old river bed. This was what Cyrus commanded to be done.

But there was yet another obstacle in the way of success. There were gates on the inside of the outer walls leading from the river to the city; and if these had not accidentally been left open on the night that Cyrus entered through the old channel of the Euphrates, his strategy to take the city, would have been in vain. But the inhabitants with their king and nobles had spent the day in feasting and revelry, and the keepers of the river-gates had forgotten to close the same on that fatal night which began in dancing and merriment, and ended in the fearful loss of human life, the destruction of the city of Babylon,

and the ruin of the Chaldean empire. Even this the prophet seems to have foreseen; for he said: The Lord "will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates" of the river in the city "shall not be shut." On that night the gates were thus left open, although it was on the pain of death that the keepers had neglected to shut them on that night. Every impartial reader must recognize the hand of God in these sad, yet wonderful events.

The name of Cyrus fills a conspicuous place in history, but how did it happen that the name was given him two hundred years before he was born? This is the material circumstance in this marvelous record which should claim our attention. We know how persons and places and things usually receive their names. The selection of a name is a contingency depending altogether on the volition of the parents, or the persons having charge of the infant named. And these volitions are often controlled by many unforeseen circumstances. To have foreknown the name with certainty, God must have foreseen and must have controlled all the circumstances. And thus again we are tempted to reaffirm that what is true of one, must be true of all; and to say "such knowledge is too wonderful for me, it is high, I cannot attain unto it."

To illustrate this doctrine more fully, let us take another passage of similar import as recorded in Micah v. : 2,—"Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel: whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

This prophecy had been carefully noted and preserved by the scribes and rulers of the people of whom Christ came. And truly that was the place—Bethlehem where he was born. But at the time of his birth, his parents, Joseph and Mary, were living in Nazareth. That was their home before and after his birth. And if Christ had been born there, the prediction would have been falsified, and he would not have been regarded as the Messiah. How then did it happen that he was born in Bethlehem? The gospel history plainly shows how God makes use of even a heathen emperor—Caesar Augustus—to accomplish what he

designed. Israel was for the first time to be enrolled by the Romans, and among those that went to enroll their names were Joseph and Mary, who according to the decree thus left Nazareth and journeyed to their ancestral city, Bethlehem, to be taxed. It was thus that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, and not in the city of his parents' home. Did all this happen by chance, or was it a mere accident?

There was far more embraced in the accomplishment of that prophecy than we are apt to think. If Jesus had been born in any other place than the one designated in prophecy, hundreds of years before, there would have been good reason for discrediting his claims as the promised Messiah. One of these two things is certain; either that God could, and that he did enable the prophet to foretell the events that occurred at the birth of our Saviour; or else that he so influenced the minds, not only of his parents, but of Cæsar Augustus, and all the parties concerned as to secure infallibly the accomplishment of his purpose. No matter which conclusion we adopt it proves a special, all-wise, and all-controlling Providence that directs all mundane affairs.

Of course, there are mysterious things that we do not fully comprehend, but that does not disprove the doctrine. In a passage before quoted it is said: "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things." In Jeremiah the question is asked: "Out of the mouth of the Lord proceedeth not evil and good?" Again, "Shall there be evil in the city, and I the Lord have not done it?" And again, in Job, it is asked: "Shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord and not evil?" All these things are ascribed to the overruling Providence of God. Even our "afflictions" as they are spoken of which are but for a moment, work out for those who are the children of God, a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Wherefore, they are not to repine, but to rejoice because of them. This is the general tenor of the teachings of the Bible.

It is easy enough for us to believe that all the good in this life comes from God. But it is not easy to believe that the hand or Providence of God is equally concerned in all the evil. We repeat, this may be a mystery, but what else can be made of the

Scripture: "I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things." But here we must make a distinction between natural evil and moral evil. God does not create sin, nor can he be the author of sin. All the natural evils in the world, or the physical calamities that are sent on the children of men by God, are to be viewed in the light of judgments or chastisements because of the existence of moral evil, or sin. This is what we are required to believe. As long as sin shall exist and God remain holy, so long there must be natural or physical evil, as the consequence of sin. Sin works ruin. If God should not punish sin, we know not how he could be holy. It is in this way, and only in this way, that we account for the existence of disease, death, wars, famines, pestilence, earthquakes, floods, and all the whole brood of calamities that come on the children of men. They are the effects of sin in some form or other. It is in this sense that God says: "I make peace and create evil."

But often we do not see the connection between sin and its effect in this life, and therefore many dispensations seem mysterious and dark. A child is born into the world with some deformity of mind and body, as the consequence of parental vice or sin. It may seem hard and severe. But who can complain of it as unjust, especially when we know that Providence is always overruling natural evil for moral good? Take an illustration.

Donald Matthewson tells us of a little boy in Scotland, who seemed to be, and indeed was, idiotic. He spoke to him something about Jesus. The little fellow replied that before he died he would sing a song, and tell him a tale. Mr. M. was absent from Scotland for a short time, and when he returned he found that the little imbecile had died, but that before his death, he had sung his song, and told his tale in the following simple and touching language:

"Three in One
And one in three;
The middle One
He died for me."

Somebody had sinned and the penal consequence is visited on the little body, in the form of idiocy. Whether the father,

or the mother, or both had committed some other wickedness, in consequence of which his brain had been injured in the incipient stage of his existence, we know not. But somebody had sinned. Yet God's purpose of salvation is not hindered nor frustrated. The little sufferer in his narrow prison—in his injured and feeble body—could be sanctified and taught by the Holy Ghost, and then be all the sooner prepared for the home of glory. The mansions above are furnished with not a few of their guests in the same, or in a similar way. God's purpose of salvation is not hindered nor broken by parental sins.

We are told that perhaps one half of all that are born into the world, die in infancy, or before they are five years old. Whose fault is it? There is guilt somewhere. Many are murdered outright in their helpless infancy, and not unfrequently by their unnatural mothers. But these souls are all saved, as we believe, and God's purpose of salvation as to them, is accomplished. God overruled the evil for good. It is then, and only then that grace reigns and becomes triumphant. The dispensation of grace came through the entrance of sin.

ARTICLE VII.

CHILD-SAVING INSTITUTIONS,

By REV. J. E. BUSHNELL, A. M., Roanoke, Va.

"One of the most laudable features of Lutheran educational work is the care of the orphan. By no other sign does she more clearly testify that she has the spirit of God 'in whom the fatherless find mercy.' When we recall the instrumentalities by which the Lutheran Church came into organic being in America, it may be said that she had her birth in an Orphan House. That glorious institution at Halle communicated the breath of life to the unorganized mass ready to perish on these shores, and from that same fountain the Church was nursed for fifty years. The great preachers of that period were graduates of that orphanage. It is therefore not surprising to read that 'one feature marked all the early Lutheran preachers, their attention to the young, the poor, the sick, and especially the widow and the orphan.'"^{*}

Child-Saving Institutions are commanding the attention of the whole Christian world. The churches generally are heeding the positive, but often neglected, teachings of the Scriptures in which God graciously reveals himself as the "Father of the fatherless," (Ps. 68 : 5). As the voice of the orphan child goes up to heaven in the hour of sore affliction, the answer of God rings through the sacred history of over thirty centuries saying: "I will surely hear their cry" (Ex. 22 : 23). Again we are told, "He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger in giving him food and raiment, (Deut. 10 : 18). "Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this," says James, "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." The general idea that the Church should provide a home for helpless orphans, is beautifully represented by the Psalmist when he exclaims:

*Dr. Wolf's "Lutherans in America," (1887), p. 454.

"Thou art the helper of the fatherless, (10 : 14). "A father of the fatherless and a judge of the widow is God in his holy habitation, (68 : 5).

"The Lord preserveth the strangers; he relieveth the fatherless and widows." We are told that Job "delivered the poor that cried and the fatherless that had none to help him," (29 : 12). "If I have withheld the poor from their desire, or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail; or have eaten my morsel alone, and the fatherless hath not eaten thereof * * If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless * * then let mine arm fall from my shoulder blade, and mine arm be broken from the bone," (Job 31 : 17ff.) The prophet Isaiah (10 : 2) pronounces a special woe against those that rob the fatherless. The same judgment is declared by Malachi (3 : 5) against those that "oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow and the fatherless, and turn aside the stranger from his right." Thus we see that the heavenly Father associates under one general class all the children of misfortune and bereavement, bringing the young and aged together in one great family circle. Child-Saving institutions in the modern form of orphan homes belong especially to the post-reformation period of Christianity. Some show of care for the orphan was made by the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans before the birth of the Holy Child, about whose infant brow the "romance of poverty" was a halo of divine significance; but the rich gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh were never lavished upon the orphanage until the star of Bethlehem guided our wise men and women of the Protestant dispensation to see new beauties and grander possibilities in the practical thought of saving the world by the spiritual regeneration and blessing of a lost child-hood. The orphan houses established in the time of Constantine, and in the fourteenth century under the care of a French confraternity were a mere streak of light in the dark sky which overhung this scriptural work. Along the pathway of the centuries we find no great orphan establishments until August Hermann Francke began his great orphanage at Halle in 1695.

Francke was a Lutheran pastor and professor in the newly established University of Halle, whose history bears a vital re-

lation to our church establishment in America and whose popularity was felt far beyond the Lutherans of this country. He was greatly influenced by the pietistic revival of Germany, which spread a spiritual influence through all spheres of life and all conditions of society before the father of Methodism was born. "His orphan and charity schools originated in connection with his pastorate. The poor of the parish came to the parsonage every Thursday for bread. He called them in, taught them religious doctrines and prayed with them."* Faith and love was his first endowment. From year to year the work grew. The Orphan House, the Burgher School, the Woman's Institute, the Bible House and the Mission Institute all grew up in order under the manifest blessing of God. At the founder's death in 1727 the work embraced the *Paedagogium* with 82 scholars and 70 teachers; the Latin Orphan School of the Orphan House, 3 inspectors, 32 teachers, 400 scholars and 10 servants; the Burgher School, 4 inspectors, 106 teachers, 1728 boys and girls; the Orphan Home, 100 boys, 34 girls, 10 overseers; the Free Table, 255 students, 360 poor scholars; the Apothecary and Book Store, 53 persons; Institute for women and girls, 30. With such a record, we can hardly wonder that Francke has been pronounced "the greatest practical educator that ever lived,"† (Kiddle and Schem, Ed. Cyclo.)

The renowned Deaconess Institute established at Kaiserwerth by Theodor Fliedner, a plain and unpretentious Lutheran pastor, whose tireless zeal, fervent piety and rare talent for organization secured the success of another great charitable enterprise. Soon after his settlement as the pastoral successor of his father, the failure of a large silk manufactory greatly impoverished his parish; but Fliedner refused to accept another charge and undertook to relieve his poverty stricken people. After visiting the benevolent institutions of other countries, making collections for his work, and being especially impressed with the noble service of Elizabeth Fry—England's Quaker queen—he dedicated to his work for the poor and the sick and the fallen, a move-

*Kiddle and Schew's Cyclopædia of Education.

ment for the care of discharged female convicts and the general advancement of prison discipline. His greatest service, however, was the practical restoration of the office of deaconess, somewhat resembling the Romish Sisters of Charity, but based simply upon scriptural teaching and precedent. The female Diaconate, organized by Pastor Fliedner in 1836, marks a new era in the Christian world. King Frederick William IV. and his Queen took the most kindly interest in this work, and by their royal favor a Deaconess Hospital was founded at Berlin. The work grew until numerous benevolent institutions, closely allied to the orphanage, have been organized in Europe and America. The Gospel has been carried into Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea. Kaiserwerth has under its control the Protestant hospitals in Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and the deaconess seminaries at Smyrna, Beirut, Florence, &c. It is the mother of similar training schools in Paris, Strassburg, St. Loup, Dresden, Utrecht, Berne, Stockholm, Berlin, &c. Florence Nightingale, born of wealthy and cultivated parents, went through a course of training under Pastor Fliedner and thus became the good angel of the Crimean war, winning a crown of glory which the touch of time can only brighten as each generation adds another star to the galaxy of a distinguished womanhood. Mrs. Fry, after a visit to Kaiserwerth, established the first English institution of the kind in London. In 1849 Pastor Fliedner brought with him to America four nurses who became the nucleus under the direction of our esteemed Dr. Passavant of an institution for Deaconesses at Pittsburg out of which grew the orphanage work.* Count Anton Von Stolberg, a Lutheran father in Silesia, was inspired by this Deaconess service to build a hospital at his own charges, in which three of his worthy daughters rendered personal service. Countess Anna was consecrated as a sister in 1854 with this prayer upon her lips, "O, that my whole life may be a thank-offering for God's great mercy." Upon the battlefield among the wounded, in the market towns among the sick and suffering, in the rail-road camps where typhoid fever was raging, she gave her life for the service of Christ and fell a victim to the plague. The Deacon-

*See Schaff-Herzog.

ess work embraces: Training Schools, Hospitals, Orphanages, Invalid Homes, and Rest Houses for the aged, with Infant and elementary schools. The magnificent Mary J. Drexel Home in Philadelphia, under the superintendence of the Lutheran Church, of which pastor Cordes has the supervision, was built at a cost of nearly one million dollars, and is training deaconesses for the service of our American Church to nurse the sick and serve in orphanage and hospital work. The annual report to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania has been supplemented by the publication of *Der Diakonissen-Freund*, which may be secured by addressing Rector Cordes, Mary J. Drexel Home, Philadelphia.

But we must return to the fatherland and mention the Martin-Stift founded at Erfurt in 1819, as a home for street-waifs and children released from prisons. It has been truly said that this orphan home at Erfurt is a grander memorial to Luther than the bronze figures at Eisenach, Eisleben, Wittenberg and Worms, where as in other cities of Europe and America we are simply reminded of the great Reformer, forgetting the child whose life was blessed by the gentle hand of Conrad Cotta's wife.

The Ranke Haus at Hamburg, founded by Johann Heinrich Wichern in 1853, of whose *Inner* mission work Dr. Stuckenbergs has written from Berlin, is the most important charitable institution in Germany next to the Deaconess Institute. It is a religious household on a grand scale, where the industrial training of outcast children, and the training of city missionaries are combined. Dr. Wines says: "The fundamental idea of the Ranke Haus is that of a Christian home. It is the mother of all those child-saving institutions which have been organized on the family plan. It is upon the same plan as the wonderful and world renowned child-saving charities of Dr. Bernardo of London. Love, sunshine and flowers are the features of these child-saving institutions, where the atmosphere of a Christian home, with a happy combination of religious and industrial training, take the place of punishment, civil reform and the workshop.* Such is also the spirit of the magnificent Orphan Home at Ash-

*See a valuable contribution in the *Missionary Review*, Vol. iii. No. 2, on "The Charities of Germany," by Dr. Bradford, to whom a general acknowledgment is gratefully made.

ley Down, near Bristol, England, founded by George Müller, whose child-like trust in God is the "romance of a real and practical conception of the truth that God hears and answers the prayer of those who diligently seek him."

Upon his own confession,* George Müller was shamefully given to a wicked and profligate life while a student of theology at the University of Halle; and while he claims that Halle was sadly tainted with rationalism, it is still true that God brought good out of all this evil. The distinguished writer of the *Life of Trust* does not render due honor to the full history of the Franckean institution and the Hallean pietists, to whom Dr. Wolf pays an appropriate tribute in his recent history.† Much damage has been inadvertently done by the world-wide circulation of a partial view of the religious life of Germany, at a period when a general wave of infidelity was sweeping over France, England and even the United States. So faithful a man as the founder of the Bristol orphanage should not fail to regard the fountain source of his own spiritual strength, which evidently reached back into a child-life which learned the word of God at the knee of its spiritual mother—the "Lutheran establishment" of the Fatherland—and the direct and personal influence of the sainted Dr. Tholuck which formed a most important factor in the drama of the prodigal's return. Dr. Tholuck, at whose feet some of our representative American theologians learned the truth was providentially elected professor of theology in Halle, at the very time when George Müller was wasting his substance in riotous living, and it was through the personal influence of this godly, Lutheran teacher in the city where the pious Francke had established his orphanage, that the founder of the Bristol orphanage was sent to England for missionary service, and eventually led into his child-saving ministry. The pure religion which visits and provides for the fatherless has established over 500 orphan homes and industrial schools in the United States under civil and corporate control. Over 5,000 officers and teachers are engaged annually in this work and 608,348 children have been cared for up to the date of the most recent official report.

*See Müller's *Life of Trust*, pp. 49-62.

†See *Lutheran's in America*, pp. 232, 270.

The expense of this child-saving service in America alone has reached fully six million dollars. Surely this is a grand good work for the glory of God and the blessing of the rising generation. The catechetical instruction of the young, emphasized by the Reformers, and the Sunday School work begun by Pastor Oberlin in the Lutheran settlement of Steinthal, followed by Robert Raikes of England, are simply departments of the general idea of Christian nurture which is a distinctive feature of the Lutheran Church.

The U. S. Commissioner of Education (Rep. for 1882-83) gives a valuable summary of statistics of the homes for orphan and dependent children. The religious denominations represented show a greater work for the Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Episcopalians than for all the other churches of America combined. This practical phase of Christian nurture has led many of the Protestant denominations to see that conversions like charity must begin at home. They have begun to realize, moreover, that when we fail to provide a home for the homeless we convert the world away from the letter and spirit of the Gospel, and render the establishment of benevolent institutions outside of the Church an absolute necessity. We need more of this child-saving ministry in the brotherhood of Christ. In making an address at the dedication of one of these institutions, Horace Mann once said, "It is not too much to spend so many thousands for the saving of a single child." A calculating hearer took the distinguished speaker to task for his bold statement, saying, "Is it not putting it too strong, doctor, to speak of spending seventy-five thousand dollars for the reformation of one child?" The prompt reply was, "Not if it were my child." Such is our answer in behalf of God's dependent children every where. From the celestial city we hear his response: It is not too much for my child. He gathers the lambs in his arms and carries them in his bosom.

"Feed my lambs," said Christ, our Shepherd,
"Place the food within their reach."
And it may be that the children
You have led with trembling hand,
Will be found among your jewels,
When you reach the better land.

Reviewing briefly the growth of child-saving institutions in the Lutheran Church of America we find only three orphan homes reported in the almanac for 1860—the Orphan Home at Pittsburg, under the care of Dr. Passavant, the Farm School at Zelienople, and the Emmaus Institute at Middletown. After the eventful course of thirty years we see a tenfold increase in the number of institutions, with doubtless sixty and a hundred fold increase of the child-saving service. Surely we should not despise the day of small things in the work which God gives us to do. In the unspeakable issues of eternity the cup of water given now to the least one for Christ shall not lose its reward.

The increase of our eleemosynary institutions for the past decade shows that the Lutheran Church is growing in general appreciation of charitable and child-saving institutions, and the following estimate must cheer every loyal heart :

INSTITUTIONS.	1880.	1890.	GAIN.
Orphan Homes.	15	34	19
Hospitable and Deaconess Insts.	8	13	5
Immigrant Houses,	6	10	4
Total	29	57	28

For a general study of child-saving institutions, the extensive work of Dr. Wines on this subject can be had of his son Rev. F. H. Wines, Springfield, Ill. The brief sketch of the Vigo Orphan Home (furnished me by Gen. Sec'y. Kellogg of the New York Charity Organization Society, with his annual report) opens a wide scope of study, giving a brief sketch of the systems in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan and Ohio. The report of the N. Y. "Children's Aid Society"—with the "Circular of Information, No. 6, 1875" and Report for 1883-'84 of the U. S. Bureau of Education,—furnish several hundred pages of valuable information and tabulated statistics.

Among the living authorities who might be consulted to great advantage, Hon. W. P. Letchworth, President of N. Y. State Board of Charities, is one of the best posted men in regard to child-saving work in this country; by the side of whom we might place Rev. Dr. W. A. Passavant, that noble pioneer of charitable work in the Lutheran Church of this country. The

benign face of this Lutheran benefactor is looking toward me from my study wall while I write his name. Let us remember, moreover, that John Martin Bolzius and Israel Christian Gronau, who were both educated at Halle in Francke's Orphan House brought the orphanage spirit to America in 1734, when they landed at Charleston, S. C.; where, says U. S. Commissioner John Eaton in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, "Schools for orphans were first established in this country in 1790," for the Lutheran (not Moravian as many suppose) Salzburgers under the leadership of the Lutheran pastors, Bolzius and Gronau, evidently deserve the historic credit for establishing the first American orphanage in their settlement at Ebenezer, Ga. Dr. Hazelius (*Hist. Am. Luth. Ch.*, p. 33) says Senior Urlsperger and Dr. Francke in Halle sent the Salzburgers considerable sums, which were collected in Germany to meet their severe deprivations, and that the British Parliament voted them the large sum of twenty-six thousand pounds (\$109,473.69) by means of which "not only the immediate wants of our brethren were supplied but they were also enabled to establish an orphan Home at Ebenezer, in which children bereft of their parents found instruction." Dr. Wolf in his recent history (p. 485) says: "The Salzburgers had hardly erected their own homes in the savannas of Georgia, when in 1742 they established an orphan home with four boys and four girls. The same institution became also an asylum for the sick, and received the warm sympathy and substantial support of Whitfield, whose own attempt at a similar institution in Savannah was doomed to failure.

"The charge of the orphan, like some other important trusts, experienced for some time a melancholy neglect, but with the revival latterly, of a better church life, a new impulse has been given to this humane and godly work. At least thirty-three Orphan Homes throughout the country are now supported by Lutherans—eight by the Missouri Synod—six by the Swedish Augustana—two by the Iowa. Some are not specially connected with any synod."

For the convenience of those who may wish to investigate more particularly the benevolent work of the Lutheran Churches in America, the following table substantially prepared by Dr. Sheeleigh for the *Lutheran Almanac* (1890) is appended.

NAME.	CONNECTION.	Opened.	Aged, etc.	Orphans
1. Orphans' Home	General Synod	1867	222	
2. Orphans' Home School, Boys	General Council	1855	35	
3. Orphans' Home, Girls	General Council	1865	32	
4. Wartburg Orph. Farm School	No Synod	1866	69	
5. Enaus Orph. House	Adjacent Synods	1837	18	
6. Orph. Home and Asylum for Aged	General Council	1859	79	
7. Ger. Evan. Lutheran Orph. Asylum	German Iowa Synod	1860	54	
8. Wernle Orph. Home	Joint Synod Ohio	1879	115	
9. Orph. Home, Girls' Dep't	St. John's Church, Buffalo, N. Y.	1864	27	
10. Orph. Home, Boys' Dep't	St. John's Church, Buffalo, N. Y.	1864	35	
11. Orphans' Home	General Council	1872	36	
12. Society of Mercy	Swed. Luth. Church, Minn.	1865	38	
13. Swedish Orphans' Home	Swedish Augustana Synod	1881	22	
14. Child Jesus Orphans' Home	Missouri Synod	1867	76	
15. Orphans' Home	Swedish Augustana Synod	1881	12	
16. Martin Luther Orphans' Home	Missouri Synod	39	
17. Orphans' Home	Swedish Augustana Synod	28	
18. L. Concordia Orphans' Home	Missouri Synod	48	
19. Home for Orphans and Aged	Private (Norwegian)	1882	13	85
20. Martin Luther Orphans' Home	Missouri Synod	1885	24	
21. Bethlehem Indian Mission School	Norwegian Synod	1884	82	
22. Bethlehem Orphans' Home	Missouri Synod	1886	73	
23. North Western Orphans' Asylum	Private property	1880	37	
24. Ger. and Eng. Orphans' Asylum, etc	German Iowa Synod	1864	30	
25. Ger. Lutheran Orph. Asylum	Missouri Synod	1873	94	
26. Scandinavian Orph. Asylum	Swe. Luth. Augustana Synod	1867	67	
27. Loats Female Orph. Asylum	General Synod	1882	12	
28. E. Lutheran Tabor Orph. Home	General Synod	1885	28	
29. Bethlehem Orph. Asylum	Missouri Synod	18	
30. Danish Orphans' Home	Dan. Church in America	1884	18	
31. Immanuel Orphans' Home	Swedish	1887	5	
32. South View Orph. Home	United Synod	1887	4	
33. Wartburg Home for Aged	Non-Synodical		
34. Deaconess Institute	General Council		
35. Luth. Deaf and Dumb Asylum	Missouri Synod	38	
36. Infirmary	General Council	1849		
37. Hospital	General Council	1863		
38. Evan. Lutheran Hospital	Missouri Synod	1858	90	
39. Hospital	General Council	1872	45	
40. Deaconess Hospital	Swedish Augustana Synod	100	
41. Lutheran Hospital	Missouri Synod	1881	38	
42. Hospital	Missouri Synod		
43. Hospital	Norwegian		
44. Deaconess House	Norwegian		
45. Immanuel Hosp. Deaconess Inst	Swedish		
46. Bethesda Hospital	Swedish Augustana Synod	1885		
47. Immigrant Mission, Ger.	General Synod		
48. Immigrant Mission, Ger.	General Council		
49. Immigrant Mission, Ger.	Missouri Synod		
50. Immigrant Mission, Ger.	Missouri Synod		
51. Immigrant Mission, Nor.		
52. Immigrant Mission, Dan.		
53. Immigrant Mission, Dan.		
54. Immigrant Mission, Swed.		
55. Immigrant Mission, Finnish.		
56. Evan. L. Seamen's Mission, Nor.	General Synod	1890		
57. Ear and Eye Infirmary		

ARTICLE VIII.

AN ANSWER TO "THE LITURGICAL QUESTION."

By REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D. D., New York City.

One of the principal objects in the establishment of the collection of liturgical books at Gettysburg, known as the "Harter Library," was to promote among scholars the study of the original sources from which the Lutheran Service is derived. It is gratifying to see from the article on the "Liturgical Question" in the January REVIEW, that this endowment is already bringing forth fruit in the translation and collation of some of its valuable material. While it is not always well to publish hastily the results of even such a laborious investigation as this appears to be, the attention that has been called to the subject will nevertheless prove indirectly beneficial in stimulating others to examine both the history and the underlying principles of the Lutheran Liturgy.

The article to which we refer, coming from the teacher of Liturgics in the General Synod's Theological Seminary, is remarkable for the boldness with which it attacks the well-considered and definite action of three General Bodies of the Church, and for the genial confidence with which it assails the conclusions of the Committees to whom the synods had entrusted this work. But as its object is declared to be simply to reveal facts, facts which have hitherto for some reason been kept concealed, but which are now at last to be brought out into the light, however much we may differ from the author in his conclusions, we cannot refuse our sympathy with the laudable purpose that impels him.

The article is long, perhaps necessarily so, since it is a veritable magazine of quotations. Many of these bear upon the questions which are raised, and may be used in supporting the writer's position. They all bear witness to the industry and ability with which he has followed up the matter. We trust that

some day these gifts will be used as effectively in building up, as in this case they have been devoted to tearing down. Unfortunately, we are not at liberty to concede in every case the correctness of the quotations, and for that reason we cannot proceed at once to the discussion of the questions which are raised. Doubtless, for want of space, some omissions had to be made. But it disturbs one to find stars [* *] in just the place where the complete quotation would materially modify, perhaps even refute the claim which is made. We fear the writer's zeal has prevented him from taking a judicial view of the question.

For example, on page 106, he claims that Luther advocated an "almost complete abolition of the festivals of the Church." On page 107 he quotes something from the FORMULA MISSÆ which seems to prove such an assertion. Now, no one questions that Luther was in favor of abolishing such festivals as St. Ursula, St. Blandina and the like. But that is a very different thing from an "almost complete abolition of the festivals of the Church." In the quotation to which we refer, Luther distinctly states that he does not condemn those who desire to use the Introits for Apostles' Days, or of the Virgin, or of other saints. In place of this statement we find stars [* *], for it would not correspond with the claim on page 106. And the very next sentence of Luther, declaring how they keep the feasts of the Purification, and Annunciation, of Epiphany and Circumcision, a statement which throws a flood of light on Luther's principles in reference to that question, does not appear in this translation.

On page 129 we find a quotation from Daniel's CODEX LITURGICUS.* Here he not only omits after the words "are called" the not unimportant limitation "*a nobis*," but after Daniel's reason for calling certain Churches Luther-Calvinizing is given, the highly important statement of the very next sentence, that the liturgies of this class are not only far inferior to the others in dignity and excellence, but that they also come very near being constructed upon the same principles as those which belong to the rationalistic period, fails to see the light.

Neither can we always depend upon the translations. The

*Daniel's Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Lutheranæ, page 133.

fact is overlooked, that some terms have a technical meaning. Expressions which in ordinary conversation mean one thing, to the scholar and historian mean something very different. On page 115, in quoting from Alt, *katholisch* is translated "Roman Catholic," and it is argued therefrom that such Orders as maintained the catholic practice were "Romanizing" in their usages. Why not also: "and were Jesuitical in their tendencies?"

To an exact and discriminating mind there is a difference between the terms "Romish" and "catholic." Following catholic practice is one thing, adopting Romish usages is quite another thing. The former is in harmony with Lutheran principles, the latter is utterly repugnant to the spirit of our Church. If we had in this case accepted the translation and had not taken the trouble to consult the original, we should have received a mental bias which would to a considerable extent have warped our final judgment.*

For such reasons we shall have to examine the article somewhat circumspectly, and, even at the risk of wearying the reader, to give a detailed examination of the paper. This will not however be altogether a waste of time, since it affords a welcome opportunity to answer questions and to explain difficulties that may have occurred to other minds.

After discovering what his real grievance is, and endeavoring to remove the objections which he finds in the way of using the Service and instructing the future ministers of our Church in the principles which govern its construction, it will remain for us simply to give the reasons why the Church has recognized this as the Lutheran Service instead of adopting something else, which has inferior claims to such recognition.

A curious feature of the article is that while prepared for General Synod readers, looking backward possibly at certain action taken by the last convention, and professedly looking forward to a renewal of the contest at the next convention, (see note on page 176), it nevertheless completely ignores the only edi-

*That Alt is accustomed to discriminate between "Romish" and "catholic" is clear from p. 453 where he makes *katholisch* synonymous with *alchristlich*. (In his KIRCHENJAHR.)

tion of the Common Service* of which the General Synod has any official knowledge. It criticises severely the action of the Synod in adopting the Service, and hurls some of its weightiest arguments against a volume which most even of the ministers of the General Synod have probably never seen. The book which it reviews is published by authority of the United Synod of the Lutheran Church. Indeed it goes so far as to claim that the book published by authority of the General Synod is not the Common Service at all, (page 119), but that the other book, of which the General Synod has no official knowledge, is the real Common Service. The reason for this claim is not stated.

For those who have only the General Synod's edition it is therefore a difficult task always to follow the argument. For example, on page 182 are enumerated 45 (!) parts of the Common Service, including an Absolution, which has no existence either in fact or in form, and both forms of the Creed, which of course are merely alternative forms. In this list, which, as will be shown later, has in other respects been unduly extended, are mentioned parts which simply do not exist.† It is true, in a note elsewhere, it is conceded that these parts are not in the General Synod's book, but nevertheless, in the place where "they will do the most good," they are all spread before us to show what a lengthy, composite and complex thing the Service really is. The ingenuity of such a course cannot be denied. The Lord commen-

*THE COMMON SERVICE for the use of Evangelical Lutheran Congregations. By authority of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, Philadelphia : Lutheran Publication Society.

†The Southern book as well as that of the General Council, varies in certain respects from that of the General Synod. These variations do not affect the integrity of the Common Service. But they were conceded by the Joint Committee in the interest of that very liberty which this article claims has been trampled upon. Thus, the General Synod's book contains Declarations of Scripture (on page 3) and the United Synod's book contains the *Nunc Dimittis* after the Distribution. Neither of these is authorized by the *Consensus*, but the Joint Committee allowed their use in the interest of adaptation or liturgical enrichment, thus recognizing an important principle, which it is claimed has not been recognized.

ded the unjust steward. But it is nevertheless questionable policy, for "facts cannot always be concealed."

We have called attention to this feature of the article, not merely for the sake of meeting some of its objections in isolated cases, but because, as we shall show later, the very foundation of some of his weightiest complaints, would have been removed, if he had used the General Synod's edition and had carefully read the Preface and the Explanatory Directions which that book contains.

Let it be understood, however, that we have no interest in commanding the Common Service as the *Ultima Thule* of liturgical excellence. It is a *terminus a quo* and not *ad quem*. Our study of Liturgies has not been confined to those of the Sixteenth Century. We have a slight knowledge of the development of the principles of worship in earlier and in later times, and are in fullest sympathy with the desire to meet the wants of living men and the present time. The ideas of adaptation and development are stated in the Preface with which our committee introduced the book to the Church, if not so vigorously at least as concisely as in the REVIEW, and with these views we are in full accord. We cheerfully concede that the book in its present form is still an imperfect work. It is, so to speak, only the frame-work of the temple that is to be. Its language admits of improvement, and its forms are capable of enrichment and change. Even among those who are now sitting at the feet of our anti-liturgical teachers, there are some who will catch the spirit of the great theme, and be able to translate the Collects into chaste and excellent English and to interpret in a hundred beautiful forms the meaning of the Divine Liturgy for the edification of our beloved Church.*

*Even the music, which was the Publication Society's contribution to the Church, and is not an essential part of the Common Service, is in some quarters made the ground of opposition to the use of the Service. A writer in the *Hartwick Seminary Monthly*, with a mathematical turn of mind, has reckoned that in order to become familiar with this Service, we must master over forty-six linear feet of music. Doubtless many choirs, instead of being frightened at this, will appreciate the compliment and will esteem it a privilege to master some of those noble chants, and to interpret in the near future "in notes almost divine" the

But incomplete as this work may be, we shall never go back to the chaotic condition which existed before the Common Service was adopted. The liturgical progress which the Lutheran Church in all the world has made during the last seventy years, and particularly during the last forty years, cannot be reversed. Even the critic of the Common Service, "standing on a liturgical plane fully as high as the German Mass, or of the Brandenburg-Nuernberg, or of the Saxon, or of the first Wittenberg of 1533," can never again be satisfied with using the Washington arrangement of 1868, with which our churches have had to content themselves during the past generation. The researches which he has made enable him to regard such an unhistorical and illogical composition in its true light, for he has looked upon the sources, and studied the reasons of our forms of worship. "For practical reasons" the Synod has indeed continued the publication of the old Order for the use of such congregations as are unable or unwilling at present to adopt the Common Service. Nor is the latter "presented as obligatory upon the congregations." But if any one imagines that the action of the General Synod is to be construed as placing the two Orders on the same plane so far as their Lutheranism or their historical accuracy is concerned, he has a poor opinion of the intelligence of that body. Of the Common Service the Synod has declared that it is the Lutheran Service. That declaration has not yet been reversed; of the other Service the Synod has declared that its use may be continued, and in a supplementary resolution declares in effect that no one shall be burned at the stake because he does not use it. With this solution of the question the friends of the Common Service were entirely satisfied.

wondrous beauty of Bortniansky's *Gloria in Excelsis* or the "*Holy, Holy, Holy,*" of the MECKLENBURG CANTIONALE. We doubt whether more elevating and stately Church Music has ever been offered to American churches. Instead of decrying it on account of its difficulty and confessing a poverty of ability and resources, the most earnest efforts should be made to inspire our young people with an appreciation of those things that are purest and best in Christian art. Nevertheless, for those who cannot do this, for those who desire simpler music, other composers will soon be found who will embrace the opportunity of supplying the people with what they want or need.

The effort has sometimes been made to issue *fiat* money. Legislatures declared that certain paper promises must be accepted at par. But somehow the price of the goods increased in precisely the same proportion as the value of the paper was less than that of gold. It would be just as useless for Synods to make *fiat* liturgies. Whatever action future Synods may take in ordering the services of the Church, we do not imagine that they will ever stamp as Lutheran that which intelligent criticism and a true conception of the genius of our Church cannot regard as such.

The article is divided into six sections. We cannot enter into all the *minutiae* of his objections presented therein, many of which are clearly due to misapprehension, but we will endeavor to subject them to a fair review, and by pointing out the general principles of the subject and the more important sources of information, enable the reader to form an independent judgment.

In the first section he gives condensed translations of Luther's Tract and two Masses, and deduces certain conclusions.

From Luther's Tract he concludes that preaching must be made the chief thing. Farel, the predecessor of Calvin, thought it and a free prayer were the *only* things proper for church, and he excluded everything else. In most churches of Switzerland and of South-west Germany to this day the Scriptures are not read at the principal Service. In some of the Reformed churches of Scottish origin, "it is a sin to sing a hymn."

No one will deny the importance of preaching; but if the inference is to be drawn that all those elements which belong to worship and the administration of the sacraments are of secondary importance, we dissent entirely from such a position. Indeed, if the question of the relative importance of the two elements, preaching and worship, comes up, we might ask, "Do we worship in order that we may hear the preacher, or do we hear the preacher in order that we may be better prepared to worship?"

It is in this section that our critic seeks to prove that Luther was a genuine iconoclast in respect to the Church Year. We have already called attention to his methods of proof. After reading this section, a list of the festivals of the Church as given

in the Common Service looks like the drapery of the scarlet woman. But we may be calm. Luther in his German Mass mentions all the festivals of the Common Service excepting Ascension, Trinity Sunday and the Reformation Festival; and he also mentions a number of others which the Common Service does not give, such as St. Michael's, Annunciation, St. John the Baptist, &c.

And if we look into Luther's Postils, we shall find that while he did not celebrate the anniversary of his own work at Wittenberg on the 31st of October, he did keep Ascension and Trinity Sunday just as faithfully as do some of his followers in the Nineteenth Century.*

Of the two Masses of Luther the article describes the latter one, of 1526, as "more evangelical." The term "evangelical," in the mouth of a theologian, has a distinct technical meaning, and we regret that the writer has not shown us in what respect the Formula Missæ is less evangelical than the German Mass. Or is it because the former contains the *Gloria in Excelsis*, and the Creed in its usual form instead of in a versified form? Luther himself, retaining as he did the Formula Missæ, does not seem to have been conscious of having become "more evangelical" in the German Mass.

Much is said in this section concerning the marvelous simplicity of Luther's services. The same thing has been stoutly asserted and widely proclaimed in some of the church papers during the past few years. The writers seek to make the impression that Luther cared nothing for a historical and orderly service, and that the General Synod, in restoring the historic order to the Churches, has departed far from Luther's practice. We do not so understand Luther. As may be seen from the

*That there is no danger of our running into "Romanizing" extremes in the observance of the Church Year, the following incident will illustrate. In one of the oldest Theological Seminaries of the General Synod, within the past three years, on Good Friday the regular weekday exercises were maintained, no special religious services were held, and a comic lecture was advertised for the evening. Providence prevented the lecturer from keeping the appointment. When such things are possible among us, is it not time to inquire, what is Lutheran practice as to the Church Year?

following table, Luther's first Order, (1523), is almost identical with the Common Service. His second Order, (1526), made no changes worth noting except that the Service was rendered altogether in the language of the people. Allowing for the advance made in the number of hymns which modern congregations can use, we cannot see that any material deviation has taken place from either of Luther's Services.

In their essential features, all three of these Services, that of 1523, that of 1526 and that of 1888 conform to the catholic liturgy of all the ages.

FORMULA MISSÆ.	GERMAN MASS.	COMMON SERVICE.
Introit or Psalm.	Spiritual Song or German Psalm.	*Introit or Psalm or Hymn.
Kyrie.	Kyrie.	Kyrie.
Gloria in Excelsis.	Gloria, or Canticle or Hymn.
Collect.	Collect.	Collect.
Epistle.	Epistle.	Epistle.
Gradual with Hallelujah.	A German Hymn.	Hallelujah or with it S. P. or H.
Gospel.	Gospel.	†Gospel.
Creed.	Creed (Versified form).	Creed.
.....	(Hymn).
Sermon.	Sermon on the Gospel.	Sermon.
.....	Offertory.	Offertory.
.....	Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer and Exhortation to communicants.	General Prayer.
.....	Hymn.
Preface.	Preface.
{ Words of Institution.	{ Consecration and distribution of the bread.	{ Sanctus
Sanctus and Benedictus.	{ Sanctus and Hymn. Consecration and distribution of the cup.	{ Exhortation. Words of Institution.
The Lord's Prayer.	The Lord's Prayer.
Pax.	Pax.
Agnus Dei.	Agnus Dei or Hymn.	Agnus Dei.
Distribution.	Distribution.
Thanksgiving.	Thanksgiving.	Thanksgiving.
Benedicamus.	Hymn.
Benediction.	Benediction.	Benediction.

Finally, in this section, our critic analyzes Luther's Liturgical Principles. These are in such complete accord with the views expressed on page XII of the Common Service, that we would respectfully commend the latter to his consideration and inquire

*The morning Service, strictly, begins with the Introit. All that precedes is introductory and may be used or omitted as occasion requires. See Common Service, page xxviii.

†The responses before and after the reading of the Gospel are optional, may be used.

whether he has not found at least one good thing in that volume, even though it be only in the Preface.

In the second section Dr. Alt's* classification of the Church Years of various *agenda* are given, while the caption reads "The development of Luther's Principles of the Common Service." What Luther's principles have to do with Alt's classification we cannot see. But the point which the writer endeavors to make is that such Romanizing (!) Orders as Brandenburg-Nuernberg 1533, (on the plane of which he confesses that he himself stands), on the one side, and the South-west German Orders on the other side, leaning to "the simplicity of the Reformed" are entirely at one in doctrine.

Attention has already been called to some of the erroneous translations of this section. Others we will quote to show how the omission of a word or a brief clause may sometimes give a completely different color to an argument. Thus on page 114 we read: "All the Church Orders are at one in the rejection of the Mass." "The popish mass" of course is meant, for that is what Dr. Alt expressly says. On page 115 we read: "These two different types * * are entirely at one in doctrine." Alt says "*dem Papthum gegenueber*," "as opposed to the papacy."[†] As opposed to the papacy both branches of the Reformation Church were at one, but as related to each other, each had its own germinal principle and from the beginning an independent development. Where this distinction is ignored, or not perceived there will also be an inability to understand the underlying principles which govern the construction of the Services.

The opinion is expressed here that the South-west German Liturgies are based on Luther's German Mass. We know of no

*Care must be taken in verifying the article's references to Alt's *Christliche Cultus*. There is no single volume bearing that title. Dr. Alt contemplated the preparation of three volumes on the subject and under the general title of *Der christliche Cultus*, but he completed only the first two volumes, *Der kirchliche Gottesdienst* and *Das Kirchenjahr*. The references to the latter work are correct, and the bookbinder's title for the whole series has probably been taken by mistake for the real title of the other book, which is *Der kirchliche Gottesdienst*.

[†]The correct translation is given on a preceding page, but not here where the argument is clinched.

one else who holds this view. The most that Harnack can say about them is that "in part they connect with the German Mass." But as no questions are raised here that will not be discussed further on, we will suspend further examination of this section.

In the third section, the article discusses the rule under which the Common Service was constructed. It is needless to say that the members of the Committee were not responsible for the rule. They were appointed by the General Synod after it had been adopted. An apology for it is hardly necessary, but a few words may not be out of place.

We must remember the conditions that enabled the General Bodies to adopt such a rule. One was a desire for greater uniformity, so that ministers even of adjacent churches should not be compelled when officiating for each other to ask, "Brother, how do you conduct your Services?" Another was a deep-felt desire, even though it did not always attain clear expression, to return to modes of worship, in harmony with the doctrine and the life of the Lutheran Church. And it is the existence of this deep underlying sentiment that will maintain in fresh and ever increasing strength the interest in this great question. Our people had indeed wandered far from the usages of our Church, and had declined even in the knowledge of what was her peculiar glory and inheritance. We borrowed freely from the denominations around us, and seemed to glory in being as unlike ourselves as possible.*

*A distinguished member of our Committee, the Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., expressed the following views as to the rule in an article in the *Independent*, a few years ago:

"The reasons which led to the adoption of this rule are the following :

"1. The sixteenth century was the period in which the Lutheran Church was organized and her doctrines formulated, the parts of her Church Service selected, and the principles of her government determined. And her symbolical writers, theologians and liturgists of that period were distinguished by their piety, learning and ability.

"2. The Lutheran Church has provided such a number of superior liturgies that neither wisdom nor self-respect will allow her to look beyond her own liturgical treasures for models in preparing an English Common Church Service, Liturgy or Church-Book.

"3. The history of worship in the Lutheran Church, both in Europe

Our brethren who came to us from abroad, even from the lands of the most liberal Lutheranism, such as Saxony, Bavaria and Prussia, failed to recognize us as Lutherans at all. Multitudes of them joined other Synods, Missouri for example, not because of their doctrinal sympathy with them, but because the character of Church life, the *cultus* was such as they recognized, and as appealed to their religious consciousness.

The report which was adopted at Harrisburg alludes to the rule in the following terms: "The longer we worked under this rule, the more clear did it become to us that it was the only rule which could give any assurance of our ever coming to a successful result. Even within the bounds of our own small committee, there were found such widely divergent sentiments with reference to the purpose, the scope and the constituent parts of the Service, that if we had not been bound by the rule, we should each of us to-day have presented a new and, doubtless, excellent liturgy of his own, instead of one old one which embodies the essential features of a Service used always, everywhere and by all Lutherans. But this result was reached not without a painful sacrifice of personal views and prejudices on the part of every one of us."

The article criticises the rule on two grounds: first, it pays no regard to the law of adaptation; and secondly, it distinguishes between pure and impure liturgies of the 16th Century, a distinction which the writer thinks does not exist; or if it does, the committee in applying the rule, rejected as *impure* liturgies which in his opinion were *pure*.

As to the first objection, the writer evidently misapprehended the interpretation and application of the rule. An imperfect

and America, that unless such a rule as makes the general consensus an authoritative directory be adopted, individual tastes, experience and preference would render a cordial and perfect agreement on all points unattainable, and prevent the preparation and adoption of a Common Church Service. The only hope of securing at last "a consummation so devoutly to be wished" was found in an honest application by the committees of the rule submitted for their government, a hearty adoption of their work by the General Bodies represented by them, to be followed by a loyal acceptance and practical test of the Common Church Service by all English-speaking Lutheran congregations in America."

quotation has again caused the trouble. He quotes the rule correctly from the Preface of the Southern Book, but the italicized words (*italics ours*) in the first half of the sentence from which he quotes might have suggested its true meaning:

"The proposal was accepted, and the three bodies united in establishing the rule by which those charged with the preparation of the work should be guided, and by which *all questions arising should be decided*, to wit: "the common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the Sixteenth Century, and when there is not an entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight."

The Harrisburg report further says:

"Your committee have carefully and faithfully examined the documents in this case, and they have come to the unanimous conclusion that there is a Lutheran liturgy, and that, while there is in many countries and at different times a slight variation in unimportant respects, there nevertheless is a substantial unity, and that, with some slight variations, the order which they here present is the Order of Service of the Lutheran Church."

It thus appears that the Synod, before adopting the report, was informed both in regard to the demands of the rule and also that *variations were allowable under the rule.*

The effect of the rule we understood to be that where the three committees could not agree, the consensus was the Court of Appeals to which we could go. This accounts for the deviations from the consensus and shows that under the rule the committee felt authorized to consider this very principle of adaptation.

We first found and agreed upon the Normal Service as deduced from the pure liturgies. (See published protocols and reports.*) This service is in essential agreement with Kliefoth's

*PROTOCOL of the Conferences of the Joint Committee on a Common Service Book. Charleston, 1884.

PROTOCOL of the Conferences of the Joint Committee on a Common Service Book. Philadelphia, 1885.

THE ORDER OF SERVICE of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Presented to the consideration of the General Synod at Harrisburg, 1885. (See Minutes of General Synod, 1885).

presentation, which the writer quotes approvingly on pp. 163 and 164, and of which he says: "The reader will be impressed with the simplicity and comparative brevity of this service." This Normal Service was indicated and approved by the Joint Committee, is indorsed by all the authorities, and was unanimously approved by the three Bodies.

After the Normal Service had thus been found, certain additions were made by way of adaptation and on the basis of mutual concession among the several Bodies. These changes were long and carefully considered, and were finally approved by the entire Joint Committee, and by the General Bodies. The report to the Synod at Omaha alludes to these changes in the following words: "The result of all this work is a Service which, while it allows considerable liberty of action in its use and admits of variation wherever the consensus does not prescribe uniformity, is in its essential features the historic Service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

In the Preliminary Principles, (Harrisburg Minutes, page 16), the following was laid down: "That, if at any time or place the use of the full Service is not desired, it is in entire conformity with good Lutheran usage to use a simpler Service in which only the principal parts in their order are contained."

But he objects to using these forms, "in their order." Well, no one can prevent him from using them out of their order. The Committee simply stated what was "Lutheran usage." And such is Lutheran usage, because our Reformers were unwilling to sever the continuity of history, and because the very structure of the Service teaches a lesson which the *membra disiecta* of unhistoric services cannot convey.

In all Lutheran lands the tendency is toward the historic Service. Variations, it is true, are met with everywhere, but the Normal Service is still the norm for all who call themselves Lutherans.*

*The critic of the Common Service speaks approvingly of the Liturgy of the Missourians, which he says is "characterized by brevity and simplicity." In order that our readers may understand what kind of a Service does commend itself to his judgment we append in a note their full Morning Service:

Kyrie—Gloria in Excelsis—Salutation—Antiphon—Collect—Epistle—

On the subject of "stagnation," which he charges against the Common Service, it may not be out of place here to quote from the Preface of our Book :

"But, while it has been desirable to return to the forms of worship used by our fathers, it is not thereby implied that the Church had its real beginning and its full completion in the Sixteenth Century. The spirit of true worship is older than the Reformation, and has found expression in many older forms than those which we have inherited in the Western Church and through the medium of the German Reformation. Nor is it meant by this Order to restrain or to limit the development of Christian worship in any forms that are consistent with the teachings of God's word."

The Common Service thus recognizes the principle of adaptation, although, as befits the circumstances, it has moved in a conservative way, and has provided comparatively few variations. What these variations are, and why they were made, will be shown. This much, however, we have stated as an answer to pp. 119-126.

But we cannot forbear to add a word here on the subject of "ecclesiastical tyranny." If there is tyranny anywhere, as applied to the conducting of Divine Service, it is to be found in the unliturgical churches

There everything is dependent upon the minister. He selects the hymns. He alone composes and offers the prayers, (fre-

Hymn—Gospel—Creed—Prayer ex corde or apostolic greeting—Second Reading of the Gospel—Sermon—Confession—Absolution—General Prayer—Intercessions and Thanksgivings—Announcements—The Lord's Prayer—Scriptural Blessing.

Then if there is no Communion, Hymn—Antiphon and Collect—Benediction—Closing verse and the Lord's Prayer (silently).

On Communion days, "Create in me a clean heart," &c.—Salutation—Sursum corda—Preface—Sanctus—The Lord's Prayer (Sung by the minister)—Verba—Agnus—Communion Hymn—Distribution—Antiphon and Collect—Thanksgiving—Benediction—Closing verse.—*Church Liturgy*, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1881.

We have given this order, omitting rubrics which prescribe many things not indicated here, not for the sake of criticising any technical errors, but that our readers may be able to judge for themselves. In what essential characteristics does it differ from the Common Service?

quently praying *at* the people instead of for them and with them). He chooses the Scripture lessons. He decides upon what themes he shall preach. The congregation is passive from beginning to end, unless perchance they have been trained to engage in congregational singing. But even then the singing is only a secondary matter, because in such churches the custom has grown up for the preacher first to read the hymn through, as a kind of an oratorical exercise. The freshness of the thought is thus taken away and the interest in the singing has to a great extent been dissipated. Can anything more despotic be imagined than the control which the preacher has over the Services of the Lord's House in unliturgical churches?

And yet this is the legitimate result, as Kliefoth has so well pointed out, (Vol. IV. p. 173), of that false freedom which the Zwinglian and Calvinistic churches obtained. Our fathers understood those tendencies, and we are under lasting obligations to them for coming to a distinct understanding in the beginning with those who "could not endure ceremonies." (Kliefoth, Vol. IV. p. 174).

In the second part of this third section, the Reviewer uses 22 pages in the effort to show that the committee on the Common Service made a false application of the rule with respect to pure liturgies. This is the most interesting portion of his criticism, and indeed the only portion demanding serious attention. He claims that we should not have ignored the liturgies of South-west Germany,* that they are also purely Lutheran and entitled to representation under the rule. From the decision of the entire Joint Committee he appeals, and challenges the verdict which was indorsed by the three General Bodies of the Church. Nor will he accept the judgment of Harnack, Kliefoth, Zezschwitz or any other of the great authorities on the subject, but in the spirit of the true scholar who desires to form an independent judgment, he brings into review the original documents and cites the names of their distinguished authors in proof of his position. If his judgment is correct, a

*Such of them as were pure, we did not reject. The line was not a geographical one, necessarily, as he seems to think when he cites "the liturgies themselves" among which are several pure ones.

grievous mistake has been made by the committee, and the Church has been woefully misled by those whom she thought she could trust. Her only course will be to retrace her steps and under abler guidance to reconstruct the Service along lines which the rejected liturgies will help to define.

As to his authorities. Klöpper (1840), he admits, mixes the liturgies together, and thinks they are all alike Lutheran. Alt and Daniel give important testimony, but we have already seen how they are made to say just what they did not say, or rather they are kept from saying that which they did say. Dr. Krauth in the *Mercersburg Review* and Ebrard the Reformed dogmatist, he says, called them Lutheran. In what respect, we are not informed, and as we have not the originals of these quotations at hand, we shall have to let them stand. And finally Kliefeth. Not, it is true, the edition of 1861 in five volumes, over 2300 pages, but the small first edition of 1847, in a single volume of 256 pages. Kliefeth is the great authority on this subject, and his judgment has hitherto been received with the greatest respect. But it is discounted by our critic who declares, (page 148), that what Kliefeth calls the pure type, "Alt, who is equally learned and equally capable as a judge and critic calls *Catholicizing*, because it holds on to the Roman Catholic forms of the Divine Service."

The writer, (Note p. 139), also differs from Kliefeth, (Vol. IV. p. 41), with reference to the influence of Carlstadt on the liturgies of South-west Germany. But we are grateful that Kliefeth, even in the early edition of 1847, and under the weight of the REVIEW article's adverse criticisms is admitted as an authority at all.

Kliefeth is important, not only for the depth of his researches, and the mass of valuable material which he has collected, but especially for the masterly analysis which he gives of the fundamental difference between the Lutheran and the Reformed systems, of the principles which control their respective modes of worship. It is true the reviewer does not seem to have read the large edition, but this analysis is presented with equal clearness in the first hundred pages of the small edition. But Klief-

foth's presentation of this distinction was all lost upon him. We find no trace of it in his article, although in just this part of the discussion such a distinction is one of vital importance.

To his mind the only differences between the two forms of worship consisted in the frequency with which the Lord's Supper was administered, whether the sermon was on the Gospel for the day or was a Communion Sermon, whether others also who had not participated in the *Beichte*, were invited to commune or not, and above all whether there was "brevity and simplicity."

And since the Common Service, he says, has taken as "its primary title" THE ORDER OF MORNING SERVICE, (which is not the case, readers will examine for themselves, it is: MORNING SERVICE, OR THE COMMUNION, and the word COMMUNION appears on every right-hand page to the end of the Morning Service), he argues that it has itself joined the ranks of inadmissible liturgies.

Furthermore, because some of our churches in this country have adopted Reformed practice, and because the Common Service has not arrogated to itself the province of a hand-book on Practical Theology, nor attempted prescriptively to correct all deviations from Lutheran practice, therefore the Common Service has itself become an impure liturgy.

It seems, therefore, as the result of the writer's study of his authorities, that the difference is altogether one of external structure, of rites and ceremonies. He has not discovered any internal or fundamental difference.

Does any one now suppose that he has correctly interpreted his authorities, or that he has read the history of those times aright?—that such external marks are the real distinction between the two branches of the Reformation Church?

It certainly does not seem reasonable to believe that these two streams of religious thought, which for nearly four hundred years have flowed on in independent courses, were not controlled by divergent principles in a matter that is so closely allied to the religious life as worship.

There *was* a difference, and, with the help of such authorities

as Kliefoth,* Hoefling† Zezschwitz,‡ Schoeberlein§ and Harnack|| we shall endeavor to point out what that difference was, premising however, that the subject is so extensive that we cannot hope to do more than call the attention of the readers to it and to invite students to an investigation of the thoughts that are suggested. The Lutheran view of the Service was first defined in opposition to the erroneous views of the Romanists. As early as 1518, in a sermon on the Third Commandment, and in 1519, in a Sermon on the Lord's Supper, Luther discusses the principles at issue. But especially in 1520 in his remarkable pamphlet on "The Babylonian Captivity" does he lay the real foundation of the Lutheran criticism of the ancient Service, showing that the Mass is not a sacrifice. In the same year he preached a sermon on "The New Testament, that is the Holy Mass," in which he enlarges on this subject in every direction. "We must carefully distinguish," he says, "between the Testament or Sacrament on the one hand which is not an offering on our part, but which is given to us and received by us, and on the other hand the offering which we bring and give and which consists in our prayer. God's word and work in man must precede, before man can do his works for God. Hence the Mass is not an offering which man brings to God, but a Testament in which the Lord allots to us an unspeakable treasure which assures us of the forgiveness of our sins. But in the Roman Mass all this is turned around, out of the Sacrament they have made a Sacrifice. But we must let the Mass remain a Sacrament, or

*Die ursprüngliche Gottesdienst-Ordnung in den deutschen Kirchen lutherischen Bekennisses, ihre Destruction und Reformation. Von Dr. Th. Kliefoth. Schwerin, 1858-1861. 5 vols.

†Liturgisches Urkundenbuch von J. W. F. Hoefling, Dr. Th., Leipzig, 1854.

‡System der Praktischen Theologie von Dr. C. A. G. von Zezschwitz. Leipzig, 1876-1878, p. 293. Also his article *Liturgie* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, at the end of the 11th volume, 2d edition.

§Ueber den liturgischen Ausbau des Gemeindegottesdienstes von Dr. L. Schoeberlein. Gotha, 1859.

||In Zoeckler's Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften. Noerdlingen, 1883. Vol. III.

else we shall lose the Gospel, Christ, consolation and all the grace of God."

In 1523, after his return from the Wartburg, he published his Tract on the Order of Service and afterwards his Formula Misæ, writings deserving the closest attention, in which his views on the Service are still further elucidated.

The distinction between Sacrament and Sacrifice is treated in full in Melanchthon's Apology of the Augsburg Confession. (Chapter XII., What a Sacrifice is.)* "A Sacrament is a ceremony or work, in which God presents to us that which the promise annexed to the ceremony offers, as baptism is a work, not which we offer to God, but in which God baptizes us *i. e.* a minister in the place of God; and God here offers and presents the remission of sins etc., according to the promise (Mark 16: 16): "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." A Sacrifice, on the contrary, is a ceremony or work which we render God in order to afford him honor.

Moreover the proximate species of sacrifice are two, and there are no more. One is the *propitiatory* sacrifice, *i. e.* a work which makes satisfaction for guilt and punishment, *i. e.* one that reconciles God, or appeases God's wrath, or which merits the remission of sins for others. Another species is the *eucharistic* sacrifice, which does not merit the remission of sins or reconciliation, but is rendered by those who have been reconciled, in order that we may give thanks or return gratitude for the remission of sins that has been received, or for other benefits received."

Now the propitiatory sacrifice cannot be made by men, but has been made once for all in the atoning death of Christ (Heb. 10: 4, 10). There remains therefore for us only the sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise, and all worship may be divided into these two parts, the *Sacramental*, including the word of God as well as Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the *Sacrificial*, including faith, prayer, thanksgiving, confession, and all good works of saints.

On this basis the Lutheran Church established her worship. Firmly believing the promise of the Lord, (Matthew 18: 20),

*The Book of Concord, With Historical Introduction &c. By Henry E. Jacobs, D. D. Philadelphia, 1882. Vol. I. p. 262.

she believed and taught that He was Himself present in the Services of his people and offering Himself and His grace to them in His Word and Sacrament. "These two elements, in which the Lord is present and gives himself to the Church, are therefore the primary and material things in worship. They are the real *Sacramentum* therein, and everything else, for example preaching and singing, obtains a sacramental character, only through connection with them, they are the absolutely necessary things, which must not be wanting nor increased nor diminished." (Kliefoth, 1847, p. 14.) "This is the one side, the sacramental. The Lutheran Church had an unshaken faith in the efficiency of the divine Word and Sacrament. Where the one is preached and the other administered, there she confidently believed, a congregation of God must come into existence, whether large or small." "Where," says the Mecklenburg Revised Order, "pure Christian doctrine is preached, there assuredly is God's Church, for God works effectively through the Gospel, and in such a gathering there will always be found some saints and elect ones who will be saved."

When Word and Sacrament have gathered a congregation, and when the congregation has obtained from them the divine life, this life must necessarily manifest itself in its own life, and in the fruitage of good works, as well as, in the sphere of worship, in petition and thanksgiving, in psalms and harmonies, in prayers and hymns, in vows and confession. This is the sacrificial element of the Service in which the congregation nourished by Word and Sacrament meets her Lord with prayer, and departs from Him with thanksgiving.

With such clear doctrinal views, drawn from the very depths of the Gospel, on the matter and the elements of Christian worship, the Lutheran Church stood in conscious freedom in her relation to historical tradition. She had a standard by which she could at all times ascertain what was allowable and what was not allowable in worship. She did not have to do as did the Reformed, overthrow everything in order to make sure that she would make no mistake. She could prove all things and hold fast that which is good, she could complete that which was imperfect, that which was crooked she could make straight, that

which was wrong she could cast away. And since the Roman Church had many things only in a corrupted form, which she had inherited from a pure Christian antiquity, the Lutheran Church in retaining these things in a purified form maintained a connection with the Holy Catholic Church which the Reformed violently destroyed. There is also another reason why the Lutheran Church moved in a conservative manner. While the Reformed Church originated in small communities, and could therefore easily make whatever changes were desired, the Lutheran Church from the very beginning, had to provide for the wants of vast territories and great nations. Hence there is constant variety in the forms of the Reformed Churches, and there was no necessity theoretically or practically for connecting with the traditions of the past. The Lutheran Church on the other hand was unwilling to break with the past excepting in so far as truth demanded. She therefore took what she found, only revising, purifying and conserving.

The Lutheran view of public worship introduced a new element, namely, a more active participation on the part of the congregation. The use of the German language in the Service, was also an important forward step.

These principles as to the matter and form of the Service, necessarily led to a fixed liturgy. The more sharply the Lutheran Church distinguished between the Sacramental and the Sacrificial elements of Service, the more clearly she saw in every mixture and want of recognition of the distinction, the danger of radical error, and the less could she be inclined to leave the composition of all these elements to accident or to the preference of the individual congregation, or the individual preachers. (Kl., 1847, p. 21.)

The participation of the congregation in the Service was a new thing, and therefore a matter the wise and prudent direction of which was not only necessary but difficult. A small Reformed community needed only a few general directions. The rest could well be left to custom or could be agreed upon as occasion required. For the great Lutheran territories there was need of a fixed Order of Service. There were also educational considerations, arising from the great importance which the Lutheran

Church attached to instruction and the culture of its congregations, which required a uniform liturgy and many fixed parts in the Service, in order that the people might feel at home in it and find their way along that which was well known.*

"For the people's sake," said Luther, "that we may teach them and lead them, we must give up our freedom and continue in one way, especially in the churches of the same confession. I would therefore ask that the same Paraphrase be used, (of the Lord's Prayer, of the liturgical use of which he is speaking), and the Exhortation *conceptis seu praescriptis verbis* for the people's sake, so that one man should not arrange it this way to-day and another man arrange it that way to-morrow, and everyone show his skill in confusing the people, so that they cannot learn or retain anything."

Hence the great labor which all the Lutheran Orders spent upon an exact construction of the Service and the fact that a number of distinguished men owed their distinction in the Reformation particularly to their services in the liturgy. Besides Luther himself, may be mentioned Bugenhagen, Brenz, Corvinus and Veit Dietrich. As a matter of course, these Orders proceed with great prudence in establishing the forms of worship; they never neglect to premise that they are not intended to present something that will suit all circumstances, or that can never be changed, or that are necessary to salvation. But at the same time any attempt to introduce a strange, and above all an *impure* liturgy, *e. g.*, the Prussian of 1558, was regarded with the greatest impatience.

In this way it came to pass that the Service became uniform, not only in each Lutheran State Church, but throughout all Lutheran Germany.

The exceptions were rare and will presently be accounted for.

*The Lutheran Church among Protestants is still the Church of the masses. Her views on Christian culture are still prominent in all her systems of Practical Theology. And here in America, at the door of the Twentieth Century, her relation to the nationalities of Europe, whose children are peopling our territory, is such as to render these considerations of eminent practical importance. No Church that is without a Lutheran system of worship need ever hope to gain or retain the millions of Lutherans who have come and who are coming to these shores.

The Reformed Church was at one with the Lutheran, in her opposition to the Catholic Church and her views of the Mass, as well as in many details of practice, for example the use of the German Language; but in other respects the difference between the two was fundamental and far-reaching. The Reformed Church did not share the views of the Lutheran Church in respect to the Sacramental in worship. According to their view, Word and Sacrament are not means of grace and the Lord is present in the Services of his House only in so far as the believers bring Him there in their own hearts. Hence, while in the Lutheran Church a primary object is to feed and teach the people, the Services of the Reformed have an excited, and awakening character. Public worship enables the believers to manifest and testify to the great work of the Spirit in their hearts. The Sacrificial element thus predominates. But if the Lutheran Church was right in believing that the Sacramental precedes the Sacrificial and is necessary to it, then the Reformed in depreciating the former, must have suffered also in the fullness of the latter element. History proves that such is the case. Their poverty in church song, for example, shows that in spite of the emphasis placed upon the Sacrificial element, it reached only a meager development, and their whole service dwindled into a sermon, and the celebration of the Communion. And even these were regarded particularly from their Sacrificial side.

The Reformed Church was therefore never able to understand and to appreciate what the Lutheran Church wanted with the Liturgy, as is shown from the following passage, from the otherwise very moderate Second Helvetic Confession, Chapter 27: "In former times ceremonies were given to God's ancient people as a means of education, because they were brought up under the law, as it were under a schoolmaster and guardian; but since Christ the Redeemer came and the law was laid aside, we believers are no longer under the law (Romans 6:14), and the ceremonies which the Apostles were unwilling to retain or renew in the Church of Christ, disappeared, because they were unwilling to lay a yoke upon the Church, (Acts 15:28). We would therefore appear as restoring Judaism, if in the Church of Christ we should endeavor to multiply ceremonies or usages.

* * * For the more usages accumulate in the Church, so much the more is not only our Christian freedom taken away, but also Christ and faith in Him, because the people seek in the ceremonies, that which they ought to seek alone in the Son of God, Jesus Christ. Therefore for pious people a few moderate and simple usages, which do not deviate from the Word, are sufficient."

How much like our modern anti-liturgists in the Lutheran Church does this Reformed Confession speak, and yet what it says is true only as opposed to Catholicism.

In such definite terms, it is true, the Reformed Church expressed herself only in Switzerland and the neighboring urban communities. On the other hand it is well known that the South-western territories of Germany from the beginning endeavored to assume a half-way position between the Lutheran and the Swiss view. In doctrine they were unable to produce a confession of their own and eventually adopted absolutely either the Lutheran or the Swiss confession. But in the practical field of liturgics they succeeded in effecting a sort of union.

We will now proceed to examine the development of the respective principles of worship in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Where the Lutheran Church was able to construct her Services undisturbed by other and foreign influences, as was the case in Middle and Northern Germany, in what are now the Baltic Provinces, in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, and in Prussia, they resulted in uniformity; the variations and differences are entirely immaterial. Not so in the Reformed Churches. The Services of Switzerland, France and England differ entirely among themselves. In their construction, with the exception of the Anglican liturgy, special stress was laid upon the radical removal of all arrangements that were derived from the Middle Ages.

The battle ground of the Reformed and Lutheran views was in South-west Germany, in Wuerttemberg, the Palatinate, Baden, Alsace and the many adjoining and intermediate imperial cities and territories. Both sides, and also a mediating party, found admirable and active leaders. The contest of the Lu-

theran and Reformed principles, as stated above, was decided in some of these territories, for example in the Rhine Palatinate, in favor of the Reformed, and they arranged their Services in accordance with Reformed views. In other countries, as in Wuertemberg and Baden, the Lutheran confession gained the victory.

But *before* the decision was reached, the churches in these countries had been drawn into Reformed channels in the arrangement of their services. They were of the opinion that all preservation even of the innocent parts of the worship of the Middle Ages, even of such as were not contrary to the word of God, would lead directly to the sacrifice of the Mass and its abuses. Hence they were induced to clear away radically the inherited forms of worship.

Besides, it must be remembered that the revolutionary elements which attempted to use the Reformation for their own purposes, and which manifested themselves in the Peasants' War, the Anabaptist commotions, &c., had more influence upon the people here than in North Germany, and inspired the congregations with a blind fanaticism against everything that had come from the Church of the Middle Ages. Again, in these countries, they were compelled by the necessities of the case to arrange the Services while yet the contest between the Lutheran and Reformed principles was raging, and in doing so they followed Reformed rather than Lutheran principles. For when conservatives compromise with radicals, the compromise is always in favor of the radicals.

If the Lutherans had not pursued this conciliatory course, there would have been an immediate rupture; and when they did at last gain the victory, they could not recover what they had lost, they had to be content with having saved the doctrine. They were the more able to do this, as they never contended that their Services were of Divine appointment, and hence absolutely necessary. The final result was that in these churches, while they adopted the Lutheran doctrine, they retained in their Services only so much of what was elsewhere used in the Lutheran Church as was absolutely essential to the doctrine. The rest they freely sacrificed as circumstances seemed to require.

The degree in which this was done varied considerably. Wuerttemberg went to the farthest extreme. In other countries where many of the Lutheran forms were retained, they were wrenched out of their proper place (in somewhat the same manner as in the Washington Order of Service of 1868, for which some of our friends are now so stoutly contending), and the entire structure was altered, in short deformed.

From all this it appears that wherever the Lutheran Church was not permitted to develop for herself her principles of worship, but the Service was adopted as the result of a contest and compromise, there we cannot find the *pure* Lutheran Order. (Kliefoth, 1861, IV. 10.)

It will be interesting to take a glimpse into the manner in which those South-west German liturgies originated. In order to do so, we must begin with Carlstadt. It will be remembered that Luther early laid down his principles of worship in several sermons. While he was absent in the Wartburg, Carlstadt appeared upon the scene. His work and principles led to tumultuous confusion which was only subdued when Luther again returned and took the helm, (on the 6th of March 1522). Carlstadt then went to Strassburg where Bucer and Capito had already gone forward in imitation of Carlstadt's methods.

On the 26th of December 1524, Bucer and the other preachers published a tract on the subject of the Mass, in which they give a statement of the liturgical work they had done. Doctrinally they leaned toward Carlstadt rather than toward Luther, and liturgically they inclined toward Zwingli, whom they frequently quote, (Kliefoth IV. 41).

When it is noted how early this liturgical movement took place in Strassburg, and how powerful was the influence which Bucer and Capito exercised on the South-west German churches, we behold at once one of the mightiest factors in the origin of their liturgical arrangements.

The other great factor in the construction of their Services was the influence and work of John Brenz. He is referred to as the father of those liturgies. Let us examine the matter and see whether he can in all fairness be held responsible for them, and

whether the result would justify their admission to the catalogue of pure Lutheran liturgies.

In 1522 Brenz, at the age of 23 became a preacher in Schwäbisch-Hall. In 1523 he still administered the Roman Mass. On St James' Day of that year he first preached against the Romish superstition. His conversion was evidently complete, and his aversion to everything that reminded him of the old Service absolute. We have an account of the manner in which he administered the Holy Communion on Christmas Day, 1525. Standing at the altar, he delivered an exhortation before administering the Lord's Supper; while the communicants were kneeling, he read the Words of Institution. Then followed the distribution in both kinds, an admonition to the communicants to lead a Christian life, and "depart in peace." This was evidently an unliturgical beginning of his career. Shortly before Easter 1526 he presented to the Council at Hall the scheme of a new Order of Service which gives many of the old parts, but in a disjointed and unhistorical manner. Nothing however came of this proposition. He himself took his stand on the Lutheran side in the *Syngramma Suevica* of 1526, but he still sided with the radicals on questions of externals. In 1530 at Augsburg he has become more conservative, and sides with Luther on these questions. In a letter to his friend Isenmann, he regrets that they had not sufficiently instructed their congregations as to the adiaphorous nature of ceremonies and other external things. In 1533 he was invited by Margrave George to aid in the reformation of Brandenburg-Nuernberg, and he assisted in constructing the Brandenburg-Nuernberg Order of that year, an Order which maintains throughout a historical relation to the Services of the past. Here he was laboring in a Church which had not been subjected to the destructive influence of radicalism. But when he got to his own home he found that when people have once broken with history, it is very difficult to restore the continuity. Ulrich, the exiled Duke of Wuerttemberg, had returned to his country in 1532. He had received the Gospel through the Swiss and the Strassburgers, and personally sympathized with that side. In the southern part of his country, the Reformed had the greater influence; in

the northern part, the Lutherans. In consequence of this, the Duke invited Blaurer, the Reformed theologian, to establish the reformation in the South, and Schnepf, the Lutheran, in the North. But first he made the two men agree, that each would "yield a little" to the other. This was found to be a difficult matter. So in 1535 Duke Ulrich called in Brenz's assistance, and as the result of his mediation, the "small" order of Wuerttemberg, 1536, was issued. Brenz had been unable to overcome many of Blaurer's positions. In the opinion of Kliestoth, this order in its liturgical directions goes as closely as possible to the Reformed view, without repudiating the Lutheran doctrine.

Some time after this, Brenz returned to his congregation in Schwäbisch-Hall, and at the request of the Council compiled the liturgy which was published in 1543. In this liturgy, he made strenuous endeavors to steer back to the Lutheran type. It resembles Brandenburg-Nuernberg much more closely than does the "small" Wuerttemberg of 1536, and contains many most excellent qualities. Our author cannot understand why such an admirable liturgy should not be considered pure. He mentions its parts (pp. 140 and 141), which to an unpracticed eye would seem to constitute it a liturgy of the highest class. But it is marked by blemishes which betray its illegitimate origin, blemishes which even Brenz could not entirely remove. For example, it omits the reading of the *Epistle*. The *Preface* is omitted. The *Sanctus* is sung by the choir during the distribution. The *Creed* is said twice. The *Sermon* follows the Communion.

These are some of the reasons why this liturgy cannot be called pure Lutheran. As compared with Brenz's work in 1526, 17 years before, considering the adverse circumstances, the progress made was equal to that which we have observed between Washington, 1868, and Harrisburg, 1885, likewise a period of 17 years. It was an honest return in the direction of pure Lutheranism. Nevertheless its blemishes ought not to be made the ground for commending it.

After this came the Smalcald War, the Interim, Brenz's expulsion from Hall, his residence in Basel, where he became ac-

quainted with Christopher, the hereditary Prince of Wuerttemberg, the death of Duke Ulrich of Wuerttemberg, Christopher's accession to the throne, the treaty of Passau and the peace of 1555. Brenz had in the meantime been appointed to a high station in Stuttgart, and in his official capacity was called upon to prepare the new Wuerttemberg Liturgy of 1553, which was republished unchanged in 1555 and 1559, and is known as the Great Wuerttemberg Liturgy.

This Liturgy connects more closely with Brandenburg-Nuernberg and Schwäbisch Hall of 1543 than did the first Wuerttemberg of 1535. The errors of the latter are corrected as far as possible. Private Confession and Absolution are restored, Church song is commended, the ministerial gown is prescribed, the Church Year is made more complete, the Pericopes are again put into their proper place.*

But certainly, it was not possible to effect a complete restoration to the Lutheran type. The Order of Service remained just as it was in 1535, except that the Confiteor became superfluous through the restoration of Private Confession. In its place a prayer was substituted.

This liturgy became the real model for all those churches which, while they held to the Lutheran Confession, were compelled by circumstances to compromise with Reformed tendencies.

We ask again, can Brenz who in connection with Osiander

*Query: Are these the things which have commended this Liturgy so completely to our author's judgment? This is the one great central pillar on which all his South-west German liturgies rest. All the others of any importance are mere copies of this one. Suppose we should meet him more than half-way and agree to ignore what we called the pure Lutheran liturgies, and accept just as it is his one great Liturgy, the Wuerttemberg of 1553. Would that satisfy him?

A short time ago we had the pleasure of witnessing the Communion Service in Brenz's own church in Stuttgart. The Order of Service is very simple. But the other ecclesiastical usages, the white robes of the ministers worn when administering the sacrament, the full observance of the Church Year, including all the Apostles' days, would, we fear, prove an unwelcome addition to our friend who is clamoring for the South-west German liturgies.

gave us a Liturgy of the highest order in 1533 be held responsible for not being able to restore entirely to a pure type the Services of Wuerttemberg. In our day, ministers are unable sometimes to overcome the whims and scruples of even one small congregation. He deserves praise for what he accomplished rather than for what he failed to accomplish.

After this general historical sketch, it is hardly necessary to point out the critic's mistakes in his lists of authors and his catalogue of the liturgies themselves. But, as arrayed in the REVIEW, they present such a formidable front, that one feels like repeating at once and declaring, "It is an incontrovertible argument, he must be right if he has all of them on his side."

THE LITURGIES THEMSELVES. He cites 16, and ceases only because he has grown "tired of this endless repetition"—like the heroes of whom we heard at Basel, who fell because they had grown weary of conquering their foes. But the most important ones in this list were *not* rejected by the committee. Brandenburg-Nuernberg (1533), and the Palatinate (1557) are pure liturgies and their order is substantially found in the Common Service. Even Pfalz-Neuberg has a correct Order of Service. Why then did he quote them? We cannot tell. Or was it that he might introduce the following, page 138: "Thus it would seem that the South German (*sic*) liturgies and KOO have a very fair paternity. * * It strikes us that it is a little too late in the Christian era for men to defame their characters or impeach their work. A grand paternity have these South German Liturgies—Luther, (?) Brenz, Schnepf, Blaurer, Osiander, Bucer, and to a degree even Melanchthon as we shall hereafter see. Any imputation upon the liturgies which they composed is an imputation upon the men themselves."

The list must in reality be narrowed down to the Wuerttemberg and Strassburg liturgies, and to those derived from the former with the exception of three others which we confess we have not seen. They are Frankfort, Hohenlohe and Erbach. The last of these enables him to add Melanchthon's name to "the grand paternity." Melanchthon's relation to that Service is very remote. Up to 1557 only a few directions had been given in Erbach with reference to the Service. In that year the Counts

published a small Order which they sent to Melanchthon and Brenz at Worms for examination. They returned the book with some marginal notes and the statement: "The order of rites does not displease us, but we have made some suggestions as to the phraseology, and in regard to the doctrine of repentance."*

Luther's German Mass is not cited here, but at the conclusion of this section the claim is put forth that it is the foundation of the South-west German liturgies, that is of the rejected ones. Proof of this has not been offered, and there is absolutely no ground for such a statement. Just the reverse is true. It was the basis of the pure liturgies which were recognized and followed by the Common Service.†

The omissions of the German Mass, to which the REVIEW article calls attention on p. 110, are either such as can be accounted for by reason of the lack of appropriate forms in the German language, or else they were not such as would destroy the integrity of the Service. And besides, whatever was lacking was soon supplied in the usages of the churches in which Luther himself subsequently ministered.

We are now able to judge whether his LIST OF AUTHORS is correct. Brenz's relation to these liturgies has been pointed out. Likewise Luther's and Melanchthon's.

Schnepf was a Lutheran and Blaurer was a Reformed theologian. Both were compelled, as we have seen, to unite in a compromise Order. The combination and the compromise, surely, do not make two Lutherans out of these men, and entitle their work to be received by subsequent generations as pure Lutheran. Even if Blaurer did sign a Lutheran formula referring to the Lord's Supper, under the circumstances his act was open to suspicion; and besides, that is not the only thing that is required to constitute a man a Lutheran.

*Richter's *evangelische Kirchenordnungen*, II, 222.

†"When by means of Luther's German Mass, order in public worship had been secured in the Electorate of Saxony, all the lands of North and Middle Germany followed one after another in the reformation of their *cultus on this basis*. Augusti estimates the number of Lutheran *agenda* and Church Orders published in the first half of the Sixteenth Century to be 132, and all of them with but a few exceptions, in liturgical relations follow Luther's German Mass." Kliefoth, iv., 29.

And what has Osiander done that he should be named as author of an impure Service? Because Osiander helped to compose Brandenburg-Nuernberg? But no Order stood higher in our estimation than did that one. How that fiery theologian, who in 1532 threw the whole energy of his nature into the conflict in favor of Lutheran usages, would repudiate the company to which he has been assigned.

Bucer only is left. Our author resents the imputation on Bucer that he was "a tainted man," and calls in witnesses to prove his good character. We will concede all the good that the witnesses may say of him. But his relations to Carlstadt, (See Kurtz, Ninth Edition), justify the epithet. Luther himself uses stronger language. Bucer translated the Fourth Part of Luther's Postils into Latin, and in a preface and a note expresses his Strassburg views of the Lord's Supper. Luther declared the preface to be *fluchwuerdig*, and the note "*gehaessig und giftig*," and ordered the printer to publish an expurgated edition at once. Herzog, III., 39. 2d Ed.

We have thus endeavored to present in a free translation, and in as compact a form as possible, the views of the great liturgical authorities on what constitutes a pure Lutheran liturgy, and on the historical developments that marked this distinction. We have not often used quotation marks, because, as was understood at the outset, we simply proposed to present in a brief and compact form the conclusions of our authorities.

We come now to the reviewer's fourth section in which he gives a "minute examination" of the Common Service. Want of space forbids an examination of all the minutiae, but we will take up the more important points. In reference to the *Confiteor* he announces as the result of his study, that the *Confiteor* as such lacks the common consent. Several pages of learned material are brought forward to support this opinion.

If he had been the fortunate possessor of the General Synod's edition of the Common Service, the following brief note on page xxviii would have saved him and his readers the trouble of considering that point:

"THE INTROIT. The Morning Service, strictly, begins with the
VOL. XX. No. 2. 42

Introit. All that precedes is introductory and may be used or omitted as occasion requires."

Besides, the pages themselves (1 to 4) were so arranged by the printer as to convey to the eye at a glance the same truth, which in the article is established by labored proof.

But, it may be asked, "Why was the *Confiteor* introduced?" Some of us did not want it and opposed its insertion as inimical to the simplicity and beauty of the Service. But it was argued that all branches of the Church in this country had always used the *Confiteor*, and its omission would not be regarded with favor. Since the days of Muhlenberg the *Confiteor* was used in all our churches. When almost everything else that belonged to the Lutheran Liturgy was lost, the *Confiteor* still remained.

Hence for purposes of adaptation, that the churches might have something that reminded them of their old Services, the *Confiteor* was retained.*

As this introductory portion does not strictly belong to the Service, we have no occasion to defend its use. The origin and arrangement of its various parts may easily be traced by those who take an interest therein.

His objections to the rubrics relating to the reading of the Scripture Lessons are of such a character, that we think they answer themselves.

He objects to saying, "Here endeth the Gospel." The reason for such a direction is plain. The congregation is thereby instructed to sing the response which follows, which itself affords a suitable transition from the Gospel to the Creed.

Our critic objects to the Offertory. He thinks it is "so entirely foreign to the recognized liturgism of the Lutheran Church, that Kliefoth does not even mention it in discussing the parts of this section." On the contrary, Kliefoth's discussion of this subject

*In this very addition, printed in "bold face" type in the committee's report to the General Synod at Harrisburg, (the minutes also, page 16, distinguish in type between the Normal Service and the additions) lies the proof that neither the committees nor the General Bodies construed the rule in the way our critic maintains it should have been construed. The committee pointed out the Normal Service with *proposed additions*, among them the *Confiteor*. And these were approved and adopted by the Synod.

is very full, and is exceedingly interesting and suggestive (I. 205 ff. and V. 54 ff.) Webster's definition is cited in order to make the term odious. In reply to such a definition, Kliefoth says: "The foolish notion which is unwilling to admit the term 'offering' and which suspects Catholicism whenever it is used, is a slap in the face of the Scriptures. Only the propitiatory sacrifice has been done away with, since Christ has offered himself once for all. But the sacrifices of thanksgiving, so far from being done away with in the sphere of the New Testament, find here their true idea and development. 'By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased,' (Heb. 13. 15-16)."^{*} The sphere of this thankoffering of the Christian is his entire life. But this is not only the duty of each individual, it is the duty also of the congregation. The question therefore arises, where may this eucharistic sacrifice find its expression in worship, in Christian *cultus*. These spiritual sacrifices are divided into two classes, the first class consisting of the fruit of the lips, such as prayer, praise &c.; the second class consisting of the fruit of our lives, a holy conversation, good works, a consecration of ourselves with all that we have and are to the service of the brethren.

"The first class find their place in that part of the Service where petition, thanksgiving and confession are offered, where the prayers of each are collected in the General Prayer. But with the fruit of our lives it is otherwise. In order that this may find a place in worship as it should, it must be done in a symbolical manner. Some one thing as representative of the rest may be done. And here the choice is easy. He that does good and communicates, he that gives what he has for the kingdom of God and the need of his brethren, indicates thereby his readiness to consecrate his life to God in the service of his brethren (Matthew 25:40). Hence it is not a matter of surprise that in New Testament worship very early, besides prayer, the bringing of gifts was regarded as a part of the eucharistic

*Also Heb. 12:28; 1. Peter 2:5; Mark 12:44; Rom. 12:1; 6:13; Phil. 2:17; 4:18; 1 Peter 2:5 ff.; Rom. 15:16; Acts 24:17; 2:42.

sacrifice. Not at all as a meritorious or propitiatory work, but as a symbol of the surrender of our lives to God in the service of His kingdom." (Kl. I., 205-207).*

In the course of time, the papacy corrupted this part of the Service, just as they corrupted other parts. But that is no reason why this eminently Christian practice should be expunged from the Service any more than the Sermon, or the Lord's Supper itself, which were also corrupted by it.

The Reformers of course rejected the Romish Offertory in the form in which they found it, and set to work to reconstruct that part of the Service. But they also understood that it had been *deformed*, and that the early Church had something else, and that this something else contained the very important constituents of the General Prayer and the Offerings. Thus Luther, in a sermon preached in 1519.† (Kl. V., 52). While the Lutheran *Agenda* were unable to find at once the appropriate form in which they might construct the Offertory, our Church never lost the feeling that the offerings and alms which were gathered in various ways and on various occasions, as at baptisms, weddings and funerals, were historically connected with the ancient oblations.

. It is true that Luther at first answered in the negative the question whether these offerings might be brought as symbols of other good works, and whether a place should be given to

*On the usages of the early Church, besides the Acts of the Apostles, cf. Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian as quoted by Calvoer, *Ritualis Ecclesiastici*, Pars I. Cap. 78. *De nummis oblatoriis ad Eucharistiam*.

"The Offertory originated in Apostolic times. The believers brought their gifts at first of bread and wine, but afterwards also other property. These were used for the Love Feasts, the Lord's Supper, and for distribution among the poor of the congregation. In succeeding centuries this custom was continued. The offering (*προσφορά, oblatio*) was not merely an act of fraternal fellowship and love, but in so far as the gifts were regarded as *primitiae creaturarum*, it was a symbolical expression of self-consecration in faith and love accompanying the offering of their prayers of thanksgivings and intercessions. Schoeberlein's *Schatz des liturgischen Chor-und Gemeindegesangs*, I., p. 300.

†Cf. Chemnitz, Ex. conc. Trid. p. 451. Apology of the Augsburg Confession, on Love and the fulfilment of the Law: Use of the Sacrament and offerings; &c.

them in the Service. But subsequently this view was overruled in our Church, even in the congregations which were under Luther's personal supervision. (Kl. V., 55). It will thus be seen that we have returned to the early Christian use of the Offertory, that in this we are sustained by the views of the Reformers, and that we have put it in the place where it belongs, in close connection with the General Prayer. The forms given in the Common Service were simply intended as suggestions. The rubric distinctly says "or any other suitable Offertory." Among such suitable offertories, the committee had in mind hymns, such as "My God accept my heart this day," "Jesus I my cross have taken," and many others which suggest themselves.

We have answered this objection at some length, because of the lack of reverence with which the subject was treated, and because it illustrates how the anti-liturgists fail to comprehend the meaning of the Service. This most suggestive usage of the Apostolic Church, the meaning of which has been explained by the Apostles and the Reformers, is to them only an empty ceremony portentous of evil.*

The closing page of this section is devoted to a criticism of the *Nunc Dimittis* and the *Benedicamus*. These parts are not in the Normal Service and have no place in the edition of the Common Service published by the General Synod. What end can be served in discussing them, or inserting them in the list of objectionable parts?

In the fifth section the writer presents Kliefeth's Communion Service "drawn from '*the common consent*' of the rigid type of Lutheran Liturgies, (italics his) and approves of its "simplicity and comparative brevity." Secondly, he announces the discovery that there is no such thing as a *consensus* of Lutheran Liturgies.

*When the people learn to look at their gifts as offerings to the Lord, $\tauὰ ἄγια δῶρα$, and associate with them the thought of giving their own selves to the Lord, they will not be apt to complain of the tax that is forever imposed upon them for Church purposes. (In olden times this was a *privilege* accorded to believers only.) The deacons also will think of the better way of gathering the offerings. Instead of placing them in the pews or stowing them away under the seats, they will ask whether the offerings to the Lord should not be placed on the Lord's altar.

And thirdly, he charges the Committee with following Loehe and depending upon him for the construction of the Common Service.

In reference to this last charge, made by the author at the General Synod, and here reiterated, we have this to say:

While Loehe is an authority entitled to the greatest respect, and is a source of inspiration to those who read his works, neither he, nor any other modern author, was allowed to influence our judgment in the construction of the Normal Service. We consulted the original liturgies of the Sixteenth Century, and depended upon them only as authority. The correctness of the result which we attained was subsequently confirmed by the verdict of the MECKLENBURG CANTIONALE, which we did not see until our work was completed, and which reports almost exactly the same order.

After the Normal Service was completed, it seemed desirable to add certain things which, in the opinion of the committee, might prove an enrichment of the Service.

From Loehe we got,

1. A line on page 7 "Glory be to thee, O Lord," the use of which is optional.

2. The Offertories on page 10, which were *suggested* by Loehe and Schoeberlein. They are taken from the 51st Psalm. Their use is likewise optional.

This to the best of our knowledge and belief was the extent of our indebtedness to Loehe for the Morning Service.

Following this section backward, his second point, that there is no such thing as a *consensus* in Lutheran liturgies, that the idea is a "*pure American figment*," is interesting because of its novelty. Fortified by letters from two learned professors, who have kindly consented to the publication of their *anonymous* opinion, he says that his "own studies in Liturgics have led him to the same conclusion * * * that there is no such thing as *consensus* among the Lutheran liturgies of Germany in the 16th Century."

The writer and his friends have evidently mistaken the meaning of the word *consensus*. An illustration will serve to make it clear. Suppose there were three authorities, original documents, rela-

ting to the discovery of America. The first says that Columbus discovered America in 1492, the second that Vespuus discovered it in 1492, the third that Columbus discovered it in 1491. Here we have three authorities, not one of which states the same thing that another does. But there is a *consensus*. Two of them agree that it was Columbus who discovered America, and two of them agree that it was in 1492. So in liturgies. Suppose we have three Orders giving the following arrangement of parts :

Introit.	Hymn.	Introit.
Kyrie.	Kyrie.	Prayer.
Gloria in Excelsis.	Gloria in Excelsis.	Hymn.

Not one agrees with any other. But the *consensus* is in favor of Introit, Kyrie, Gloria in Excelsis, because the majority indicate those parts and in that order.

Moreover, he again overlooks the fact to which attention has been called before, "*that every disputed point* is to be decided by the consent," &c.

In the first part of this fifth section our critic gives Kliefoth's list of parts, commends it for its brevity and simplicity, and presents it to his readers in order that they may see what a "wide difference exists between it and the Common Service." This is another remarkable passage in this most remarkable paper. After criticising the Common Service to the best of his ability, and ignoring or repudiating the principles on which it was constructed, he commends a service which is almost absolutely identical with the Common Service. Excepting one point which need not be mentioned here, we have no controversy with any one who will accept Kliefoth's list. It is the true Lutheran Service. And the author of "The Liturgical Question" highly commends it!

In presenting the following tables to show the conformity of these Services we will explain how we obtain the result.

In the first place we use the General Synod's edition of the Common Service. If our critic had done so too, it would have saved him many pages and much misapprehension of the subject. Secondly, we omit the *Confiteor*, which our Book distinctly declares to be not a part of the Service. Thirdly, we omit two

optional parts, the Sentence after the Hallelujah and the words "Glory be to thee, O Lord," before the reading of the Gospel. Fourthly, for the sake of indicating that the succession of parts is the same, we combine in the Common Service those parts which liturgically form one part, or are otherwise intimately connected. Kliefoth's own views indorse this, and in some cases they are simply not mentioned in Kliefoth's list for the reason given in the note below.

KLIEFOTH'S LIST.	COMMON SERVICE.	SIMPLER FORM OF THE COMMON SERVICE.	WASHINGTON ORDER of 1868. "Invocation."
Choir Hymn and Gloria Patri.	Introit.	Psalm or Hymn.	Sentences. Gloria Patri. Coffeot. Kyrie.
Kyrie.	Kyrie.	Kyrie.	
Gloria in Excelsis.	Gloria in Excelsis.	Hymn of Praise.	
Salutation and Collect.	Salutation and Collect.	The Collect.	
Epistle.	Epistle.	(Scripture Lessons and Epistle.)	
*Hymn.	Hallelujah.	(Hymn).	Creed.
*Gospel.	Gospel and Response.	Gospel and Response.	Gloria in Excelsis.
Creed (versified form.)	Creed and Hymn.	Creed.	Reading of the Scriptures
{Sermon.	Sermon with Votum.	Sermon with Votum.	Hymn.
General Prayer.	Offertory and General Prayer.	Offertory and General Prayer.	Prayer.
Hymn.	Hymn.	Hymn.	Hymn.
{Preface.	Preface.	Preface.	Sermon.
{Sanctus.	Sanctus.	Sanctus.	Closing Prayer (Lord's Prayer.)
Exhortation.	Exhortation.	Exhortation.	Hymn.
{ The Lord's Prayer.	{ Words of Institution.	{ Words of Institution.	Benediction.
{ Words of Institution.	{ The Lord's Prayer.	{ The Lord's Prayer.	(For the rest of the Service, no provision seems to have been considered necessary.)
Distribution and Agnus Dei.	Agnus Dei and Distribution.	Agnus Dei and Distribution.	
Thanksgiving.	Thanksgiving.	Thanksgiving.	
Benediction.	Hymn.	Hymn.	
*Hymn.	Benediction.	Benediction.	

*Kliefoth it is true does not mention the Hallelujah here, nor the response after the Gospel; nor does the Revised Mecklenburg Order from which his list is taken. But the reason for the omission is stated by him in his introduction to the Mecklenburg Cantionale Vol. I, Part 1, p.

11:

"The Revised Order does not expressly prescribe that the *Hallelujah* shall be sung after the Epistle, and the *Laus tibi, Christe*, after the reading of the Gospel. But as these responses were always used in the old liturgy, which the Revised Order follows exactly in other respects, and because the Revised Order prescribes the singing of a Sequence after the Epistle, and the Sequence included the *Hallelujah*, we must assume that the Revised Order omitted these responses for this reason only, because they were presumed to be used as a matter of course."

†There were certain usages connected with the form of delivering the Sermon which are not stated with the same particularity as is observed in the rubrics of the Common Service, because they were generally understood and were not necessary.

[Notes to †, ¶, §, ||, are on the next page.—ED.]

Is it not strange that a man who is "impressed with the simplicity and comparative brevity" of the first List should so utterly disapprove of the second, and pronounce it "the most extreme and elaborate Protestant liturgy in the world?" When he adds that the wide difference between the two is at once apparent, readers must conclude there is something wrong with his glasses.

In the sixth and last section our author endeavors to show how closely the Common Service follows the Roman Mass, avows his "zeal for a true, genuine, historical Lutheran liturgy," and finally presents some comparative tables to show the extreme lengthiness of the Common Service.

As to the Romanizing character of the Common Service our author has himself offered a sufficient defence, in his commendation of Kliefoth's list of parts, with which that of the Common Service is in substantial accord. His personal profession of liturgical faith we are glad to see recorded, and if he lives up to it in the future, we shall gladly forgive his inconsistency in the past. But as he calls especial attention to his comparative tables, we cannot refuse to grant the courtesy.

We note, in the first place, that where his object is to prove great prolixity and elaboration, as in the case of the Common Service, he counts parts which in so many words are declared to be not parts of the Normal Service and need not be used, *e. g.*

¶Our critic adds here four additional parts to the Common Service list, viz. the *Salutation* and *Sursum Corda* and their responses. But these, in Kliefoth's judgment, are integral parts of the *Preface*. (Canticale, I. 1. p. 26.)

||This ancient sentence was not adopted into many of the Lutheran Orders. Luther used it in his Formula Missæ, warmly commanding it as *vox plane evangelica*.

¶We have added to Kliefoth's list, as given by the reviewer, the *Sanctus* and the *Agnus*, which he had inadvertently omitted.

§Our critic says *Doxology*, which is an error. Kliefoth mentions a hymn. For purposes of comparison, and to fill up the page, we also append the Washington Order of 1868, for which some of our friends have formed such a warm attachment. We think we have seen it stated that it is founded on the German Mass. If so, the structure seems to have got out of plumb. [Dr. W. omits the Prayer after the Kyrie in the fourth List as revised and now published.—ED.]

the *Confiteor*; he counts alternative parts as though both were to be used, e. g. the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, which are each counted twice; he counts salutations and brief responses which are not parts, but which in liturgical usage are merely accessories; and he inserts parts which do not belong to the Normal Service, (the Communion) and which have never been admitted to the book published by the General Synod, e. g. the *Nunc Dimittis* and the *Benedicamus*. In this way he makes the Common Service to consist of 45 (!) parts.

We note, in the second place, that where his object is to demonstrate great brevity and simplicity, as opposed to the prolixity of the Common Service, he omits from the list parts, the existence of which his study of liturgies should have recalled to him. The Brandenburg-Nuernberg he says "ordered nine parts," p. 184. According to his own table on p. 183 there are twenty. But he omits the *Gloria Patri* after the Introit. The compilers of the *Agenda* could not foresee that any writer on the subject would not be aware that the *Gloria Patri* was always used with the Introit, or they would certainly have inserted it. (In the Common Service the *Gloria Patri* is mentioned, otherwise the number of parts would have been only 44.) So too with the response, "And with thy Spirit." (In the Common Service list it is given, otherwise there would have been only 43 parts. But then this loss might have been made up by counting a number of *Amens* as distinct "parts.") Speaking seriously, the *Agenda* omitted many things which were understood as a matter of course as belonging to the details of the Service.*

We cannot be offended however at such arguments, because they have helped to relieve somewhat the severity of the discussion. Indeed we should hardly have taken the trouble to point them out, if it were not for that mighty "DARE," with which his article finally explodes.

When we consider the author's misapprehension of the rule, the singular construction he puts upon the meaning of *consensus*, his application of a different standard of "parts," and above all his utter failure to comprehend the internal structure and meaning of the Lutheran Service, we cannot wonder that he was

*Cf. Mecklenburg *Canticale*, I. 1. p. 11.

unable to construct the Common Service out of the eight liturgies to which he refers. Time and further study will enable him to do so. In the meantime we will leave the chip where he has placed it, and afford him the satisfaction of seeing that nobody has dared to knock it off. In the light of the principles which we have discussed, and the history which we have reviewed, our readers will be able to answer the question for themselves.

We have thus endeavored to give a calm and intelligible reply to the article under review. If our strictures have occasionally been a little severe, the occasion that called them forth we think justified them. Certainly it required great restraint to refrain from writing a polemical review. But nothing would be gained by such a course in the end. What our ministers and churches want to know is whether we are moving in the right direction. We believe that we are. Are the positions of the REVIEW article then entirely untenable? Apart from its inconsistencies, which are many, they are. If we were a Reformed Church, or if, as the article claims is the case with our English-speaking churches in this country, we have become so closely identified with the other denominations as to have lost our distinctive characteristics, then its author's position would be correct, and the sooner he could impress his views upon the students of his theological classes and send them forth to complete the work of amalgamation, the more faithfully would he perform his mission. But, thanks be to God, the consciousness of our Lutheran origin, and the knowledge that in being true to ourselves and obedient to the truth that has been revealed to us lie the sources of our strength, are controlling forces in our church life.

The true development and life of our Church is so intimately connected with its doctrines and historical character that we cannot safely depart from them without imperiling our existence. And the sooner those who occupy positions of influence, where they can help to build up a truly Lutheran sentiment, recognize the signs of the times, and devote their strength and talent to the work which the Church has a right to require of them, the sooner will we be able to take possession of the goodly land that lies before us.

The adoption of the Common Service has been a most important work in the direction of establishing our Church on her own historical foundation. Whatever imperfections it has, will soon be recognized and removed. Whatever opportunities for adaptation and enrichment are offered, will be embraced. In a few years our youth will have learned to love its goodly proportions, and will wonder that the fathers had ever laid it aside.

"By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." Heb. 13:15.

"Non vox, sed votum; non chordula musica, sed cor;
Non clamans, sed amans; cantat in aure Dei."

ARTICLE IX.

A PRACTICAL ANSWER TO "THE LITURGICAL QUESTION."

By J. C. KOLLER, D. D., Hanover, Pa.

During the protracted discussion on our "Order of Service" at the last convention of the General Synod, Dr. Conrad declared with emphasis that "those who have introduced the COMMON SERVICE in their congregations must not be disturbed in the use of it." The sentiment was generally and heartily applauded. And when the resolution calling for a Book of Worship without the COMMON SERVICE was negatived by more than a two-thirds majority, while the fullest liberty in the use of either service was allowed, there was a fair understanding, at least among the friends of peace, that this should end agitation and disturbance. This understanding was doomed to disappointment; the remarkable tranquillity which the General Synod enjoyed for a quarter of a century, and which is one of the secrets of the progress made in general church work and self-respecting church loyalty is not to be permitted to continue. To some minds a storm is preferable to a calm even though ships be wrecked and precious freight destroyed.

By many intangible maneuvers and devices that do not make

for fraternal unity, the work of disturbance has been carried forward without a formal protest hitherto.

The very extended article in the January number of this REVIEW, which like the practices just mentioned is distinctly and manifestly aimed at the destruction of the COMMON SERVICE, makes patience and silence no longer virtues. No true friend of Lutheranism can resist a feeling of sadness that this rash, wanton, and unwarrantable attack has been made on a movement which from its very inauguration promised so auspiciously. But as the "gauntlet has been thrown down for the glory of God," some liturgical scholar will no doubt accept the daring challenge.

A certain theologian once expressed great anxiety that no competent reviewer of the Spencerian philosophy could be found, because no living authority commanded Herbert Spencer's logical ability, persistency of research, and dexterous facility in the presentation of facts—at least phenomena into which he could argue the appearance of facts. It is to be hoped that our theologian has recovered his equanimity, for since the dust and smoke raised by Spencerism have cleared away, the old truths stand forth with clearer-cut distinctness and greater beauty than ever before.

The Lutheran Church has men who have made Liturgics a life study. To them we leave the task of answering the audacious statements and formidable array of quotations of the article in question. The present writer must be content with a humbler duty and proposes—not a defense or vindication of the COMMON SERVICE—it needs none, but some practical considerations.

A friendly criticism of the article is rendered somewhat difficult because of its misrepresentations, self-contradictory argument, and negative, sometimes even flippant, treatment of a confessedly important subject. Its purpose is not problematical. It is easy to read between the lines a tentative attack upon liturgical worship, for the reflections upon the COMMON SERVICE hold as strongly against any liturgy. It is only fair to say that alike those who are most pleased with this article and those most deeply grieved by its appearance, interpret it as an attack on all liturgical worship. The final issue will undoubtedly be

liturgical worship according to the spirit of the COMMON SERVICE, or non-liturgical worship with freedom from all prescribed forms, each man being his own liturgist and his liturgy his own practice.

A careful study of the article brings into clear prominence three main objections to the COMMON SERVICE: 1. It is an historic misnomer; 2. It is un-Lutheran; 3. It is not adapted to "the environments."

I. Does a statement of facts convict the Service of being unhistorical? We need not go to the 16th century just now in quest of facts. On this point the article is an astounding revelation. If its premises are logically and historically sound, if its conclusions are legitimate, the Joint Committee chosen by the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South, have after four years of patient, laborious and conscientious investigation, either ignorantly or willfully foisted upon the English speaking Lutherans a service which is false in its conception, un-Lutheran in its construction, Romanizing in its tendency, impracticable in its application and subversive of the faith and piety of the Lutheran Church! (Page 177). Although the author deprecates "impugning the motives of men, whether the living or the departed," with the inconsistency that marks the whole attack he seeks to lead his readers to the conclusion that this Committee was utterly incapable for or untrue to the work entrusted to it, and the three general bodies which appointed the Committee, are either the dupes of a few designing "doctors," or they have sinfully misapprehended their responsibility.

This certainly is a summary way of brushing aside one fact in the historic movement. We name some of the men who constituted the Committee: Rev. M. Valentine, D. D., LL. D., whose reputation as a profound logician and theologian is known in the first Colleges of our country; Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., LL. D., whose homiletical and liturgical ability of forty years of practical service as pastor, professor, and editor, entitle him to the grateful confidence of the church; Rev. E. J. Wolf, D. D., for fifteen years professor of Church History and

author of a work which is recognized as a model of fairness and historic fidelity by all parties in our church and by the literary public; Rev G. U. Wenner, D. D., an Anglo-German scholar whose twenty years of devout study of liturgical literature ranks him side by side with the best informed; Rev. A. C. Wedekind, D. D., whose devotional spirit, long experience and thorough acquaintance with the church life of Germany as well as that of America, give him peculiar claims to sit on such a committee; Rev. B. M. Schmucker, D. D., confessedly the greatest liturgist of this country, with the finest liturgical library in America, whose thirty years of uninterrupted study of Liturgics makes his judgment worthy of implicit reliance; Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., whose eminent and thorough scholarship makes him an authority in Lutheran theology; Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., the magnificent pulpit orator, and author of various liturgical volumes; Rev. C. W. Scheaffer, D. D., LL. D., the able church historian; Rev. Adolph Spaeth, D. D., a German University graduate and professor; Rev. E. T. Horn, D. D., whose acquaintance with Lutheran literature fits him for the most responsible position. These are some of the men who formulated what is now pronounced an "historical misnomer." They have been universally esteemed as men of the highest Christian integrity. To treat their work flippantly—especially when one is under the disadvantage of inadequate opportunity and an indifferent knowledge of the German language—is a specimen of colossal assurance. And yet the article intimates on page 185, that the Committee is guilty of "some sort of editorial legerdemain," and imputes to these men mediaevalism, ignorance of history, and the *concealment of facts!* If its allegations and insinuations are true, they ought all to be committed either to the state's prison or to an asylum for imbeciles, according as they were the abettors or the dupes of a conspiracy against the Church.

It is certainly a puzzle how one man alone and without consultation can know more on a great subject in a few months, than a score of acknowledged specialists, his equals in all respects, who have devoted many years to the same subject, and who held meeting after meeting for years, consulting together in perplexity

and patience on the points involved. Perhaps, however, the best explanation of the problem is the difference in the conclusions. The one man says: "There is no historic service." The entire Committee say: "This is the historic service." Whether the testimony of the one man is to outweigh the testimony of twenty, let an impartial public decide.

The COMMON SERVICE, has, however, the advantage of another fact well known. It is the historic endorsement of the Committee's work, which fact, it has become the fashion, to ignore persistently. At the Convention of the General Synod in Springfield, Ohio, in 1883, when the resolutions proposing the appointment of the Joint Committee to prepare a COMMON SERVICE according to the working rule of a pure Lutheran basis, were presented, the membership rose to their feet as one man and with enthusiasm passed to their adoption.

Two years later at Harrisburg, Pa., when this committee offered their unanimous report, showing what is the Lutheran Service drawn from the *Consensus* of the 16th Century, and declaring that no Service materially deviating from this could possibly be formulated by any other committee on the basis agreed on at Springfield, the General Synod again, after a full and frank discussion and unclouded explanations, without one dissenting voice, accepted the COMMON SERVICE, instructed the Committee to complete and publish the work, and enthusiastically sang: "Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

Then at Omaha, Nebraska, two years later, Dr. Valentine presented the completed work with the statement that "while it allows considerable liberty of action in its use, and admits of variation wherever the *Consensus* does not prescribe uniformity, this is in its essential features, the historic Service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," the General Synod once more declared its approval of the COMMON SERVICE, and instructed the Hymn Book Committee to publish it in all future editions of the Book of Worship.

And last of all, not a year ago the General Synod, constituted not of the same persons which composed the conventions at Springfield, Harrisburg and Omaha, but almost entirely of different delegations, significantly re-endorsed this Service as Lu-

theran and historical. These are all facts of *modern* history—accessible to the humblest of the people—not entombed in scholastic Latin and cumbersome German—plain and unvarnished facts, which can be known and read by all. Why there is a studied and persistent concealment of these facts, must perplex candid and intelligent minds. And they are forced to inquire how much reliance can be placed on a writer in his interpretation of history which transpired 300 years ago, when he coolly ignores a series of important facts that have occurred within eight years?

But not the least amazing feature about this condemnatory judgment is its late appearance. It is mortifying, beyond expression, to be overwhelmed at this late day with such monumental testimony from ancient and modern authorities, that it was irrational for the Joint Committee to adopt as a guide the *Consensus* of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the 16th century; that there was no such *Consensus*, and that the COMMON SERVICE does not conform to the *Consensus!* What a misfortune that the author did not raise the voice of warning, until all the Committee's work was completed, unanimously and heartily endorsed, the Church supplied with the printed forms and many congregations had already introduced them. What a terrible responsibility to remain silent! Was it not his duty to enter a mighty protest at Springfield (where he was present) when the General Synod adopted the very rule which he now so bitterly condemns? Or should not the most urgent objections have been entered at Harrisburg (where he was also present,) when the COMMON SERVICE, with provision for every part except a few immaterial sentences, was first presented? Or why did he not appear at Omaha and antagonize Dr. Valentine's report with all the potency of fidelity to Lutheran liberty and liturgical knowledge, before ever this Service was incorporated in our Book of Worship? Why did he by a significant silence, if not virtual consent, allow all this to go on? Perhaps he was not a member of any of these conventions; but neither was he a member of the Allegheny convention where his prominence and activity in attempting to bring discredit and destruction upon the COMMON

SERVICE, surpassed the energies of the most interested delegate. Possibly this vast liturgical knowledge is a recent acquisition! This may explain much.

Why, one may ask, does he even now give a qualified endorsement to the Service—only “not full and hearty” (page 177), although he fully believes that it is a very dangerous innovation—yea “knows it positively” as he tells us, and defends his opinion in an eighty-page compilation of quotations from Latin, German and English sources? Is it not fatal inconsistency? If the Service is worthy of even a *quasi* recognition, why all this denunciation? And if it is such an absurd “historic misnomer,” what shall the Church say to the utter *untimeliness* of this violent attack? Have we not the right to expect those who presume to teach us to be wide awake and at the right time protect us against the inroad of error?

And now, it is necessary to say a word about the *intent, purpose* and *contents* of the COMMON SERVICE, all of which are glaringly misrepresented by the article. Perhaps it is sufficient to refer the reader to the Preface to the Common Service, the force of which it virtually acknowledges by attempting to cover it with ridicule. It calls it “an obscure Preface which is seldom read” (page 176); and sophistically tries to give the appearance of weight to its argument by quoting from the Preface of the United Synod’s edition, with which the General Synod has nothing to do. The article emanates from the General Synod Seminary, concerns therefore General Synod interests, but *conceals* the very rule adopted by the General Synod for the guidance of its churches. Obscure! Indeed! Here it is: 1. “It is not obligatory on the congregations;” 2. “If the full service is not desired it is in conformity with Lutheran usage to follow a simpler form in which only the principal parts in their order are used;” (What are the principal parts and in what order they follow, must be intelligible to any one who cares to know;) 3. “For those who desire the complete service, ample provision has here been made;” and 4. “It is commended so long as its use serves to edification.” Such are the simple terms of the Preface, which were satisfactory to all, because here there is provided what suits the non-liturgical churches, the moderately liturgical, and what

meets the taste and needs of those wishing an elaborate form. A wiser measure and one more discriminating and liberal was never adopted by an ecclesiastical body. It is remarkable for its liberty, fairness, adaptation, variety of alternating forms, spirituality, simplicity and common sense. These are the very features for which the article professes to plead. It does seem that any one who is capable of comprehending the spirit of liturgical science, who has openness of judgment or sufficient patience to read the explanations, instructions and rubrics, will admit the committee's unmistakable sincerity of purpose to accommodate a service to the preferences of individual congregations in city or country. What a spectacle to have men cry out for Lutheran liberty when it would be impossible to have a more striking example of it than is here furnished! Yet the insinuation runs all through the article that the Service is compulsory in its intention, obligatory in all its parts and enslaving in its purpose. To what possible motive is such a procedure attributable?

But this same unfairness is characteristic of the entire article. And the reader, willing or unwilling, is driven to the conclusion, that it is the work of one who in an unhappy hour conceived a bitter hatred to the Service, and then reading up with no care to discover or present facts as they are, but deliberately distorting their character, goes on to give a show of justification to his attack. Every student of the history of Liturgics knows, that when literally translated, fully quoted and fairly interpreted, nearly all the authorities used by Dr. Richard in condemnation of the Common Service, are against his theory of an "historical misnomer," and sustain the Committee. Besides, it is patent to everyone that his reflections upon the historical actions of the General Synod, place that body before the world in the attitude of self-stultification and convict it of folly, fraud and dishonesty. If the criticisms are true, this influential body has been recreant to its own interests and faithless to its principles.

II. But is the COMMON SERVICE a Lutheran Order of Worship? Dr. R. tries to show by a complicated and heterogeneous array of quotations, that it is untrue to the principles of Lutheranism because its tendency is to *depreciate the preaching of the Gospel.*

It is difficult to find an example of greater unfairness and misrepresentation. And although the charge is absolutely untrue, it is emphasized, if not by positive statement, then by implication in one form or the other from beginning to end. He does worse.—In preparing the way for his unqualified condemnation of the Service, he restates Luther's strong partiality for preaching, in a way to make it appear that a full service is the death-knell of what Protestantism holds to be the chief means of extending the kingdom of God. He, however, overlooks the fact that Luther said: "If God's word is not preached, it would be better neither to sing, nor read nor come together." This would certainly prevent many a modern prayer-meeting and strikes equally at non-liturgical worship.

It requires an extra amount of grace for a Lutheran pastor to sit patiently under such an unjust statement of the case. For what friend of the Common Service proposes any other method of saving men than by applying to them the word of life? The question carries with it its own answer with such self-evidence, that no notice would be taken of the accusation if it were not repeated and emphasized as an especially valuable discovery. But it is difficult to see how the Common Service can reasonably be charged with depreciating the preaching of the Gospel, by one who is known to express to the students his preference for the Episcopal Prayer Book, about four times the length of the Common Service; and who favors the old "General Synod Form" which one of its present champions at one time pronounced "a wretched piece of legalism?" If the purpose of the discussion is to exalt the "legalistic and semi-Episcopal old General Synod form" at the expense of the new General Synod form—which is undeniably Lutheran—why not say so? For the former is longer, heavier in movement, more cumbersome than the latter, therefore would be a greater hindrance to the preaching of the Gospel.

The article shows the same unfairness in its specious argument from *Lutheran simplicity*. But why magnify the simplicity of Luther's German Mass, for instance, in order to condemn a service which any unprejudiced mind will pronounce simple enough for the uncultured, as it is elaborate enough for those

who favor "enrichment in worship?" Voluntariness, flexibility, accommodation—these elements of simplicity are everywhere conspicuous.

Luther excluded the grand anthems and glorias, because there was no suitable music at the time. He further intimates that his environments compelled the use of the simplest forms because "the Germans of his time were a wild and uncultured folk, with whom not much could be done, except under pressure of the direct necessity." See Herzog *Abriss der gesammten Kirchen Geschichte*, Theil III. page 54. Besides he desired a few "immovable forms in order that the people, on account of diversity of pronunciation, might not be led into error. See Herzog as above. For the same reason he denounced *long sermons and extemporaneous prayers*.

If the testimony of Church History is of any value; if the writings of Luther are capable of being understood by the ordinary reader; if the *consensus* of standard Lutheran writers is of any force, then this article wildly misstates Luther's opinion in regard to the purification of the mass and the consequent simplification of worship. It either misapprehends it entirely or wilfully tries to mislead. Is it true or is it not true that Luther, in preparing his German Mass, embodied much of the devotional part of the Mediaeval Service? And though he magnified the reading of the Scriptures and the preaching of the word, the Reformer who retained altars and images as aids to devotion never dreamed of dispensing with the liturgy. It is well known that he was looking forward with great hope for the appearance of a better liturgy than his own, but this expectation has been interpreted by partisans to mean that all liturgies should disappear! The great Reformer's loyalty to the Augsburg Confession is generally admitted. Zöckler in his commentary on the Confession says that the XV. Article lays down the principle that liturgical institutions and observances are to be maintained and observed when they are sinless. He subjoins that the attitude of the Confession abides as a wall of adamant against all false subjectivism and unchurchly radicalism. It turns with the most decisive firmness against all iconoclastic zeal which would break with the continuity of Christian history

and shape all ecclesiastical affairs according to fortuitous circumstances. Plitt in his "*Evangelischen Lehrbegriff*" shows the rationale of Luther's liturgical views as based upon the doctrine of the Confession. It is needless to say that this theologian gives no support whatever to the argument of Dr. R.

Anyone who knows anything about it admits that "the purified church service is not taken from the mass but the mass is thrown out of the service." The Romish Mass consisted of three parts: 1. Selections from the word of God. 2. Pure and precious additions breathing the very spirit of God's word which were in use from early antiquity. 3. The unscriptural elements which crept into the service in a corrupt age. Luther rejected the 3d. altogether; the 2d. he simplified somewhat for reasons elsewhere stated in this paper, and the 1st. he amplified into using whole psalms as introits. Any life of Luther, any church history, any work on Liturgics, any commentary on the Augsburg Confession confirms the above statement, and all will further show that the great Reformer neither by precept nor practice contradicts a single element in the Common Service.

The intimation that if Luther had lived awhile longer, he would have abandoned his liturgical preferences altogether, in the interest of greater simplicity and because "forms and ceremonies" cannot procure salvation, is a serious reflection upon his character. It is of a piece with the other assumption that had he lived long enough, he would have at last denied all the peculiar dogmas of the Lutheran Church, forgetful that our creeds and our worship must abide in Scripture and not in Luther.

But Dr. R. wants a simpler service, unmindful that the flexibility of the Common Service supplies every facility for abridgment. He calls the Common Service too formalistic, forgetting that the advocates of simplicity are probably the most formalistic of all, rigidly enforcing the same iron-clad service every Sunday; always the stereotyped way, morning and evening—prayer-meeting and all; inflexible sameness—Medo-Persian unchangeable formality. A certain pastor, impatient of this intolerable straitness, attempted to have the Sunday-school repeat the Creed and

the Lord's Prayer. But the authorities quickly commanded ; "Stop that, none of your Ritualism in here."

An active and thoughtful Christian, susceptible of his environments, tires under this wearisome sameness both morning and evening, year in and year out. He longs for a service which varies for the day and alternates between the morning and evening worship. He breathes a new spiritual atmosphere among the appropriate Introits and devout Collects which exhale the Christian thought of centuries ; their manifold variety, and constantly recurring fitness the devout worshiper recognizes with grateful satisfaction. Said one who was at first repelled by the novelty of the Common Service : "I now thankfully recognize the stimulus of these beautiful forms—new to me every Lord's day morning. It is no longer the subjective experience of my pastor—his peculiar idiosyncrasies—but the voice of God's Spirit speaking to the Church." We are reminded of Rev. Dr. C. A. Stork's memorable utterance : "They are no longer the voice of one man—the minister ; they are not even the aggregated utterances of the present congregation only : they are the full echoes from the past ; the Church of the ages is heard praising, supplicating and adoring through them."

It is a great satisfaction to remember that these sentiments are re-echoed by many younger clergymen whose intellectual and spiritual nature received the impress of this beloved teacher's life. Just so there are many laymen whose active sympathy heartily responds to the principles of worship as taught by this latest English product of Lutheran cultus.

And may we not entertain the hope that those who mean to plunge the Church into useless controversy and divisive strife, will be completely disappointed—whether their purpose be a self-vindication, or an ill-concealed effort to bring humiliation upon an opponent, or a desperate attempt to repress the conservative Lutheranism of the Church. Or will the Church blindly follow the lead of one who has made the two greatest discoveries in history, first, that the altered Augsburg Confession states the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper more strongly than the original, (LUTH. QUARTERLY, Vol. XVIII., p. 372); second, that there is no historic Lutheran Liturgy ?

The most unfounded charge against the Common Service is that it is *Romanizing* in its tendency. The article seeks everywhere to make this impression. The eye of the superficial will catch the word "Romanistic," further it may not glance; that is the water-mark of all the quoting and appealing. The article is spread in pamphlet form among the people in order to create the suspicion that a poison has been surreptitiously introduced among the Lutherans. Even from pulpits people are warned that "this whole thing" is taken from the Romish Mass. Said one who tried to read the article: "I don't understand it; but it says your Common Service is taken from the Catholic Church, and the Synod will soon make short work of it." Assuming that this teacher and his apologists are correct, it is Romish for a congregation to confess its sins; it is Romish for a minister to close his sermon with the words of the Apostle: "The peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus;" it is Romish for the people to sing just after hearing the sermon: "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, &c., &c." One is driven almost in despair to ask, if this be Romish what may a minister or a congregation do that is not Romish? But this charge is confirmed by an anonymous learned "Missouri Professor." And to show what friends Dr. R. summons to his aid in defaming a work of the General Synod, in the preparation of which two of his colleagues took part, we quote the latest authoritative judgment from Missouri: "The General Synod is Lutheran in nothing but the name." *Unterscheidungslehren.* St. Louis, 1889. p. 53.

It is the pulpit that promulgates heterodox notions. To be a Romanist one must hold Romanist doctrines. And we may hear the baldest Romanism preached—the most ultra unprotestant ideas, Socinianism, Pelagianism, work-righteousness inculcated, irrespective of the liturgical preferences of the preacher. Therefore let us tear down the pulpits and silence the preachers!

Even the Oxford movement in the Church of England is called in to frighten Lutherans. But Newman and his friends were dissatisfied with the formularies of Episcopalianism—not that these formularies were uncatholic, but because they required

a different *apologia*. Hence their doctrinal ethic had to be reconstructed; it had to be expressed in less Protestant terms. The Service could be no bridge to Rome until laid with Romish planks. (*Andover Review*, Vol. XII. 63.) Would you therefore strike down the worship of the Church of England? But the verdict of church history is plain enough and so is the teaching of historic Lutheranism. Any one who has the patient candor to compare Articles VII. and XV. of the Augsburg Confession—"those rites are to be observed which may be observed without sin, etc"—will be easily convinced that the "rites and ceremonies" so strongly reprobated were something quite different in their nature from scriptural forms of worship—that is to say—they were "carnal ordinances" employed for the purpose of appeasing the wrath of God. Hase, in his *Polemik*, page 479, declares that Luther in his Order of Service, acknowledges, even in the times of his bitterest variance with Rome, that the Catholic cultus had a purely Christian origin, that it is rich in emblematic uses; and no one can deny that by it millions of faithful Christians now obtain daily comfort and edification as well as for centuries past. But guilt rests upon the Romish Church for making the divine service a meritorious work to accomplish reconciliation between God and man, instead of employing it as the natural and outward expression of piety and the means of nourishing and quickening the soul's affections. Let us quote here the testimony of Dr. Conrad. Combatting with his usual vigor the unjust insinuation that liturgical worship develops ritualistic tendencies, he argues "that only the illiterate regard any church that uses a liturgy and forms in worship as ritualistic." "According to these," the Doctor proceeds, "God, by giving the Jewish church a ritual, made it ritualistic, and as nineteen-twentieths of Christendom use forms in worship and are thus ritualistic, there remains only a small fraction of the whole Church of Christ which is not ritualistic."

"But if it be employed to designate the tendency in Protestant circles, of approaching and adopting the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation and of baptismal regeneration, *ex opere operato*, then we deny emphatically that there is a single part or a single

sentence in the morning Service of the Episcopal, or that contained in any Lutheran liturgy that savors of ritualism. And if any Anglicans or Lutherans have become inoculated with Romish sacramental tendencies, it has taken place not because of, but in spite of their liturgical church services." (LUTHERAN QUAR., Vol. XIII., page 173.) Dr. C. excepts no Lutheran liturgy—ancient or modern. It will be remembered that the last edition of Löhe was already published at the time when this testimony was given, the very liturgy of which Dr. R. would have us believe the Common Service is a transcript! So was also the *Mecklenburg Cantionale*—a work prepared by a commission headed by Dr. Kliefeth—*and the latest development of Lutheran cultus in Germany (1880)*—to which the Common Service closely corresponds. Hence, since Dr. Conrad detected no Romanism in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England—not even that of Edward VI; and since he pointed out nothing condemnatory in Löhe's liturgy, the church may feel safe that as an honored member of the committee he would not charge Romaniestic tendencies to the Common Service. His testimony can be placed side by side with that of the sainted Fred. Wm. Krummacher—whose anti-Romish and even anti-high-church Lutheran views are known to all. In a sermon on the "Safety of the Church" he says: "To nourish, strengthen and refresh us, we have our beautiful Divine Service and the preaching of the unadulterated Gospel."

III. Is the Common Service a suitable Order of Worship? One of the objections urged against it by our critic is its *lack of adaptation*. An effort is made to show that it is an anachronism, out of touch with the age, and predominant thought and spirit of our nation, hence impracticable and worthless. And, if the multiplicity of citations could prove anything the objection would be plausible; but citations are often similar to thunder and lightning, which sometimes have their origin and end in the clouds. That is to say, these citations reflect the opinions of fifty years ago and, being colored by the rationalistic tendencies of the time, they are less in accord with the spiritual atmosphere of the day than the Lutheran liturgies of the 16th century. As an example, compare the distorted argument about

the Prayer Book of King Edward VI., based on meaningless quotations, with the account in Green's "History of the English People," Vol. II. 226, of the same Liturgy. Either the English historian or our Professor has fallen into a glaring error, for their opinions are diametrically opposed to each other.

If one looks for genuine adaptation, in the Common Service he will find it. This feature of an acceptable Liturgy demands three dominant principles: (1.) A firmly established *basis*; (2.) *historical continuity*; (3.) *fidelity to the spirit of the age*. Whilst the article against the Common Service flies in the face of each of these principles, the committee in formulating it remained true to them all throughout.

Take the *basis*, for instance. No cultus can be adapted which is not a substantial out-growth. All liturgical writers agree here. Shall it be the environments? It is doubtful whether a solitary authority can be found to sustain such a position. The very moderate Hagenbach says: "The Christian cultus rests on Christ and his Church; hence the foundation of the liturgy is not laid in anything outside of the Church nor in the culture of the age, nor in the abstract theories of individuals, or religious philosophisings or scientific speculations. The essence of worship is the essence of religion itself; thus the essence of Christian worship is the essence of Christianity, consequently the essence of Protestant worship is the essence of Protestantism;" "*Grundlinien der Liturgik*." Thus the essence of Lutheran worship is the essence of Lutheranism. On precisely this principle the committee was appointed, which formulated the Mecklenberg Canticale at whose head stood Dr. Kliestoth, the prince of Lutheran liturgists; and yet Dr. R. quotes him as opposing the very work he constructed! "The representatives of the Lutheran Church returned to the old Lutheran liturgies, in their movements for reform," says Kurtz in his Church History (Vol. II. 320—old ed.), because in the days of Illuminism and Rationalism, the surest blow against Christianity was to strike down the pure Lutheran Cultus.

Hence the wisdom of appointing a Joint Committee to act for the English-speaking Lutherans of America, at a time when there was a widespread dissatisfaction with our liturgical status;

and the reasonableness of the rule which accepted as a basis the pure Lutheran liturgies of the 16th century, the time when the Church was at its best state and still under the power of the great revival called the Reformation. Such was the general desire for an improvement in our worship ten years ago and so strong the sentiment for greater uniformity, that not a voice was raised against either the movement or the instruction of the General Synod to its committee.

And the committee, let them have the credit, were as loyal to the *Consensus of Christianity* as they were to that of Lutheranism. Their work springs not only from the 16th century, but from the first. Only the blindest prejudice will presume to deny its purely Biblical tone. A prominent pastor who does not use the Service, says: "Whatever objections men may find against it—one thing remains for ever true—it is eminently scriptural." Having, besides, the sanction of centuries as well as the approval of the English Lutheran Church—it may be confidently trusted to meet the demands of the age. The cry of non-adaptation is a false alarm.

The wise observance of the "*continuity of Christian thought*" is always emphasized as an essential in rational adaptation. The Christian thought is the thought of God; and whether it engages the Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Teuton or Anglo-Saxon mind, it belongs to neither exclusively. Each one of the nations is "thinking God's thoughts after him." These thoughts are first principles, and principles are eternal. They do not change; they do not even develop in the ordinary sense of development; doctrines *about* these principles change and develop, but not the principles. They may become more clearly defined, more elaborately stated; "they may be overlaid with superstitions and purged from accretions; they may be assailed with the fiercest bigotry and defended through good report and evil report,"—but they are like the mighty river rolling on whilst opinions about them, confessions even, are only the eddies in which human passions play for a while, and controversies about "points" momentarily rage, only to be borne down by the onrushing currents.

The worship of God is a principle—not a dogma—it moves

onward, growing mightier in its historic movement. It absorbs the best thought of the age and appropriates the highest art for adornment, enlargement, enrichment. Schleiermacher says that "in the Christian Church the difference between yesterday and to-day must be obliterated; nothing must appear as of to-day; therefore every total transformation is improper; everything must grow out of one generation into the other."

Anyone who will give thoughtful attention to this matter will be convinced that those who originated the idea of the Common Service—those who formulated it—those who adopted it, and those who are now using it—have observed this law of continuity and therefore have followed a quite different *consensus* from what the malcontents try to force upon them (page 185)—namely the *consensus of thought and spirit*, and not that of "points" and parts—a mechanical formula consisting of verbal coincidences and liturgical rubrics.

But he who clamors for liberty, should also be willing to allow liberty to the regularly constituted authorities. He who insists that the agency of the Holy Spirit is equally capable in forming liturgies by single individuals, should at least admit the possibility of that Spirit normally working through the regular channels of the Church. Surely we have not forgotten the immortal saying of Irenæus: "*Ubi Ecclesia, ibi Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, ibi Ecclesia.*" Or are we to adopt the maxim "*Ubi Papa, ibi Ecclesia?*" Is there no danger from individualism? Yet what else is this attempt to displace the Common Service but an attempt at breaking with the continuity of Christian worship? It is taking the matter away from the regularly constituted authorities and locating it in the hands of an irresponsible individual who was not authorized to act. The fatal outcome of such a position is not difficult to discern. If it were simply the wickedness of disturbing and distracting the churches, encouraging factious and refractory members "to seize this Service as a club to punish" hard working and loyal pastors, the procedure would only be ungenerous to the rank and file. If it were no more than an arraignment of the Joint Committee and the castigation of a few "learned doctors," it would end in a controversy between the experienced and the inexperienced. But it is an

unconcealed attempt to stigmatize and humiliate the General Synod. Read the article carefully and you will be convinced that if the position taken by its author can be maintained, the General Synod has lost all claim to the respect of the churches. If its committees are appointed without discrimination, its instructions given thoughtlessly and heedlessly, its unanimous votes taken blindly and recklessly, without regard to or knowledge of the truth, then the sooner the body were dissolved the better. Such a central advisory organization has no right to its existence.

Therefore the remaining essential of a rational adaptation—namely *fidelity to the spirit of the age*—stands forth in significant contrast with the entire tenor of the article under review. The fact that this is a liturgical age is entirely ignored by the author; he does not appear to know of the almost universal demand for enrichment in worship, to which the Common Service is the first formulated response among the English-speaking Lutherans.

Indeed, the spirit of the age is against modification and simplification of the divine worship. Dr. Conrad's article in the QUARTERLY, April 1883, gives a synopsis of views from leading men in the prominent denominations, which form a veritable *consensus*—not of 16th century Lutherans, but 19th century Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Dutch Reformed, etc. When such intellectual giants and pulpit-princes as Drs. Bushnell, Woolsey, Hitchcock, Storrs, Budington, Goodwin and others “lament the lack of the people's participation in the Sabbath service both as respects the barrenness of the service itself and as conducted solely by the pulpit,” is it not astonishing that anyone can be found in the Lutheran Church—which has always been liturgical,—so out of touch with the spirit of the age as to advocate a reactionary movement?

There is certainly no dispute among Protestants concerning the absolute necessity of the preached Gospel as the key-note of Christian efficiency and life; nevertheless it is universally admitted that unless the people be given a larger share in the services of God's house, the primitive Christian doctrine of the universal priesthood is practically abandoned. To divest the

worship of God of priestcraft and priestliness is the purpose of the liturgy, which means "the service of the people." The most pronounced feature of the Common Service is to give the people the amplest, best and freest opportunity be to themselves "kings and priests unto God." It says to them: "Come let us worship the Lord." "Let all the people say, 'Amen.'" Hereby it protests alike against Romanism and Calvinism, in both of which you will find the worship of God conducted by the clergyman and the choir—very often at opposite ends of the Church. And yet now we have the strange inconsistency of a professor in a Lutheran theological seminary trying to prove that the less liturgical we are the more evangelical we will be," a Lutheran theologian teaching that Calvinism is preferable to Lutheranism.

But hear the people. A member of a very prosperous city church in accounting for the large attendance, among other reasons gave the following as the chief: "Here we worship God as did our forefathers—even as in Luther's day. *The people join in the worship.*" One such practical fact demolishes volumes of theorizing about imaginary "adaptation." Said a country pastor: "If mine were not a 'union' church, I could introduce the Common Service without a choir."

"Difficulties are found in this Service, not by those who look for them, but by those who do not take the trouble to look." If there is any aversion to it, the responsibility rests upon those who do not use it, never did, do not intend to use it and will not allow their own congregations or others, if possible, the use of it.

The Common Service, by its fulness yet simplicity, its thoroughness yet flexibility, appropriates and magnifies the principles of Lutheranism. It has been well said that the service of the Protestant Episcopal Church to religion is scarcely less through its maintenance of the evangelical doctrine of the Person of Christ, than through the importance it attaches to public worship. Indeed the ritual is so permeated with Trinitarian expressions that worshipers must accept the Divinity of Christ with cordial assent. Surely where cardinal scripture truths are earnestly repeated from Sunday to Sunday, the worshiper would have to be either an arrant hypocrite or commit himself to the doctrines taught by them, whereas in the non-liturgical church

he simply "goes to preaching and not to worship God," as says the Presbyterian, Dr. Hopkins; and in the forcible words of the Chicago *Interior*, "he turns the sanctuary into an auditorium, the congregation into an audience, the Sabbath service into a lyceum—to whom church vagrancy is preferable to churchliness.

As a teacher of young men who are to occupy Lutheran pulpits, Dr. R. certainly would not discount denominational fidelity. His words on page 178 are not sentimentalism: "So long as four-fifths of the American people are yet without the pale of the Church he declares it his conviction that the function of the American pulpit and of the Sunday morning service, is as much the evangelizing of the masses as the edifying of believers." The two-fold function is well balanced in theory; why then does he in practice misuse his place and opportunity to antagonize the Service adopted by his General Synod for the purpose of edification? His attitude instead of "edifying believers," discourages and disheartens them; instead of "evangelizing the masses," it disgusts and scatters them. The Christian churches which have been most faithful in the edification of believers, even according to elaborate forms of worship, are the most successful in the evangelization of the masses. And in explanation of the unwillingness of congregations which have adopted the Common Service to abandon its use, we put on record the facts which "DARE" contradiction, namely that they have lost nothing in popularity, spiritual efficiency, financial prosperity, numerical strength, benevolent activity and evangelizing power. These churches, in their loyalty to the deliverances of the General Synod and in accordance with the spirit of the Common Service, never attempt, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the worship of others whether it be semi-liturgical, non-liturgical or anti-liturgical; but, in the name of our Lord and Master, they ask that they be not disturbed in worshiping God according to the dictates of their conscience and the liberty of Evangelical Lutheran Christians.

ARTICLE X.

A LITURGICAL RIDDLE.

BY A GENERAL SYNOD PASTOR.

Dr. Richard begins his very lengthy article, with the statement that he is moved to his action by the design to promote "the glory of God, and the good of the Church." He doubtless felt that such a definition of his motive was called for, as so relentless an attack upon the Common Service of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Church, and such a fierce attempt to plunge us back from the border of the land of promise into absolute liturgical chaos, would naturally not suggest such an originating motive.

But when this purpose is so distinctly announced as a justification for what on its face would seem so needless and disloyal an assault upon a service so carefully prepared, and so officially authorized by the three great English-speaking Lutheran organizations of this country, we have a right to expect that the writer proceed in accordance with it, and that his statements be accurate, his presentations consistent, his logic fair, and his inferences and conclusions just and honest. On the contrary, after a most careful study of the article in question, one can only explain its remarkable perversion of facts and inconsistencies of argument, on the ground that Dr. R. began with a preconceived theory of antagonism to the Service, which so warped his judgment, that everything, *nolens volens*, was forced into subjection to this theory. To make this clear, I will glance in rapid review, at the leading points of the article.

LUTHER ON UNIFORMITY.

A studied effort is made to show that Luther was utterly indifferent, and indeed opposed, to a uniform service. To establish this, extensive quotations are made from Luther's utterances in defence of liberty in the use of forms of worship. But how

totally different a thing it is to argue against "lording it over any one," and to argue against a common order of worship. The former, Luther and every Protestant would oppose, the latter, Luther just as vigorously favored. Why, the very fact that he felt it proper to show that such an order was not to bind the conscience, was because *he was in the very act of putting forth an order by which the so greatly desired uniformity might be effected.* Accordingly Luther thus positively puts the other side of the question. He says: "While such liberty, however, is not to be restrained or forbidden, every one must be put upon his own conscience in regard to the manner in which he exercises his freedom, which must be so governed by love as to become the servant of his neighbor. But where this has been done, and yet given offence, on account of the variety of forms used, it becomes our solemn duty to restrain this liberty as much as possible, in order that the people may not be offended, but improved by our example * * in bringing about unity of sentiment, as well as uniformity in practice; for it would be very desirable, if in every country, town, village and city, uniformity in worship should prevail in all their churches."

Why try to pervert the great and wise leader's sentiments! And who can doubt from these words, and in view of Luther's strong, good sense, and regard for order, that were he living to-day, he would see the weakness and manifold evils of our discordant services, and be the foremost champion of a common Lutheran worship?

APPEALS TO PREJUDICE.

No form of argument is more to be deprecated than this. A scholar should be above it. The advocate of a good cause should not need it. A fair-minded disputant should scorn any advantage derived from it. Yet here we have that narrowest of appeals to prejudice based on the age of the Common Service. Its materials are of the sixteenth century! Therefore we are to condemn it. This argument will no doubt array against it Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, &c., who never have revered an historic church basis. And it may be popular with ignorant and unthinking clergy and laity.

But let us see what it involves. The objections that the ma-

terials of the Common Service are as old as the 16th century would apply with far greater force, to the Glorias which are many centuries older still, as also to the Creeds and Collects, and destroy the liturgy altogether. But further, it would apply with yet greater force to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism. For as forms are less important than doctrine, we would more urgently have to rebel against holding to a 16th century confession and catechism than to a 16th century service. By a glaring inconsistency, thus, after objecting to the age of the Common Service, Dr. R. wishes to retain in it just the parts that are old, Creed, Gloria in Excelsis, Gloria Patri, Collects, &c., and opposes precisely the features in it that are *new*, modern and near the 19th century, as Confiteor, Offertory, &c. But the point to be kept in view here is this. If our voluntary acceptance of a rule, viz., the common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the 16th century, "involves the principle of stagnation and ecclesiastical tyranny," then our acceptance of the Primitive Creeds and Lutheran Confessions is a more galling stagnation and tyranny still. And the result will be the destruction of the doctrinal and liturgical *Consensus* of the ages. We must cut ourselves entirely off from the witness-bearing, the historical, Church of Christ. No! a truth, a creed, a prayer, a hymn, a form of worship is not to be discredited or rejected because it is old. That the Christian fathers of all the centuries have used a certain prayer of faith and love in the sanctuary, or a confession at baptism, or an utterance of hope at the graves of their holy dead, only makes its words more inexpressibly dear and assuring to our hearts. God forbid that we must discard these precious forms merely because, though they have withstood the test of ages, *they did not originate in the present generation.*

So, likewise, opprobrium is sought to be cast on the Common Service on the ground that its frame-work is *built upon the Romish Mediaeval Mass*. We reply, were not Luther's Formula Missae and German Mass built upon the cardinal frame-work of the Roman Church Service? Was not the Reformation itself built upon the cardinal truths of the Gospel which yet underlay the Romish corruptions? Is it not our boast that we have not cut ourselves off from the Christian vine,

which though cast down has never been destroyed from the earth? Was Luther's work a de-formation or a Re-formation? Abuses were reformed, and mediaeval rubbish was cast off. And then upon the underlying rock of pure truth the work was established. We are not a totally and essentially new Church, but the pure historic development of the old. It is not the weakness but the glory of the Common Service that it is built upon the model of the primitive church, and that it perpetuates the usages of the pure Christian Church of all ages. Such a historic service unites and makes one in faith, confession and worship, Christians of every time. The opposite principle is radicalism, individualism and destructiveness.

Further, on pages 178 and 180, an appeal to popular prejudice is made on the ground of the resemblance between the Common Service and the General Council's Church Book. How unworthy a motive to interfere with a great church securing its historical service. How would it look for a General Synod Lutheran to tell a Presbyterian, that his body would not adopt the Lutheran service because some other Lutheran body had been for some years using one very much like it!

But when we look at this fact in a dispassionate, fair-minded manner, such as becomes the Christian scholar, what does this close correspondence between the two books prove? That two bodies acting independently of each other, should have adopted the same rule and reached practically the same result—though there are wide differences, as e. g. the evening service—is simply strong corroborative proof that *there is a proper historical Lutheran service, and that this is the Common Service.* Therefore, this fact instead of prejudicing the Service, should the rather commend it to every Lutheran.

Against all these appeals to prejudice we enter our earnest protest, as containing no argument whatever against the Common Service. The rather do they commend it as the genuine service of the past.

TRIVIAL OBJECTIONS.

The desire for the Common Service is so general, and the efforts of the General Synod have been so great and protracted to secure it, that only insuperable objections should stand in the

way of its use. But this article fairly beats the bush to find difficulties. Every little thing is seized upon, and after reading page after page of apparent learning and ominous declamation, we are amazed to find how perfectly indifferent and trivial the things objected to are. *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus.* For example, on pp. 153 and 154, fault is found with the rubrical directions stating in chaste words where the gospel is written and ends, and there is discovered in these simple insignificant brevities, a "day-idolatry" and "subservience to time and seasons" borrowed from papal darkness."

A tirade is indulged in against the beautiful and churchly word "offertory," which so aptly characterizes our offerings, and the words of the psalm, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," &c., are criticized as though the Holy Ghost had indited a latent Romanism. On p. 158, the *Votum*, i. e. "The peace of God," &c., at the close of the sermon, is objected to. St. Paul is the author of it and used it as a benediction near the close of his letter or sermon to the Philippians. Dr. R. waxes very indignant over the Versicle near the opening of the Confession, "I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord. And thou forgavest the iniquity of my sins," intimates that this closely follows the Roman Mass and has no shadow of claim to be there. Indeed to him there seems something terrible in the usage of this touching quotation from the 32d Psalm. We envy neither the disposition nor taste of one, who claiming to be a Christian can wax so indignant over so exquisite a passage of Scripture containing the marrow of the Gospel.

And in fact on p. 169 the admission is fairly made that what objection is taken to is of no account, thus: "The difference * * is not very great in the *number of words*, but great in the *shaping* and in the *character* which it imparts to the service." To find objections he is driven to "shaping and character," to mere form of arrangement. Failing in all else, he would here scent something wrong and portentous. Was ever a contestant more pressed for expedients to find some faint ground of opposition? And for such mere trivialities as these, must we Lutherans abandon the immeasurable gains to be derived from uniformity, from coming fraternally together in one service? If even the "per-

sonal Orders of Luther and Bugenhagen were superseded "by a general church Order, and thereafter used by them" (page 116, note), instead of their individual ones, can we not sacrifice such petty and forced objections for the general good, unity, strength and repute of our beloved Lutheran Church?

CONTRADICTIONS.

Of these the article is singularly full. It first charges that the Common Service is Luther-Romanizing, then charges it to be Calvinizing, (p. 162 and p. 133), "one of the most "*uniting*" liturgies that ever *bore the Lutheran name*." On p. 175 it is compared with the Roman Ritual, and described as so extreme and elaborate as to be altogether un-Protestant; and yet on pp. 131 and 132 it is asserted that in its radical idea, "it has been constructed on the principle that the preaching service is the chief thing," as over against the communion being the chief thing, and that therefore, in its central idea it rather is modeled after the Reformed than the Romish idea.

And after admitting this very point on p. 132, it is expressly contradicted on p. 178 by the declaration that the Common Service puts the altar above the pulpit, which he had before emphatically refuted.

Page 175, Dr. R. declares it an "historical misnomer" to say that the Common Service is a "consensus," and on p. 165 says expressly that there is "no such a thing as a consensus among the Lutheran liturgies of Germany in the 16th century." And then gives up his whole case by saying on page 166, "But let the rule [*i. e.* of ascertaining the consensus] be allowed to extend to a mean between the extremes, then it will give *about* such a liturgy as that furnished on a preceding page by Kliefoth."

We observe a still more decisive contradiction on p. 163, where is given Kliefoth's own exhibition of the normal type, or the average usage of the liturgies of "the Lutheran type," (which, in a note he says, "It is easy to give"). And of this "normal type" Dr. Richard says: "The reader will be impressed with the simplicity and *comparative* brevity of this service," p. 164. Yet when we come to compare this "normal" and "brief"

Lutheran type with the Common Service, leaving out the *Confiteor*, which is not properly a part of the Common Service, we find the two to be virtually the same. See page 338. The difference would not make four lines, and Kliefoth's hymns in place of the Introits and Hallelujahs really make his the longer Service. This close correspondence of Kliefoth's average to the Common Service and Dr. Richard's warm praise of the one, contrasted with his intense dislike for the other, leave the impression that his opposition is factious.

On p. 125 it is asserted that the Common Service "flies in the face of the principle of adaptation." After contending for several pages that the rule of common consent bound the committees like a belt of iron to a slavish transference of 16th century forms, he proceeds to demonstrate that influenced by this very principle of adaptation, they departed in nearly every instance from the *consensus*. Hence the Common Service was constructed on his identical principles. And what is the more remarkable is that the very features of the Common Service wherein the committee asserted the freedom of the Church and law of liturgical growth, e.g. *Confiteor*, *Offertory*, *Nunc Dimitis*, *Versicles*, &c., are the very features which he most severely censures and opposes. In other words, while denouncing a return to 16th century usage as violating the principle of liturgical growth and adaptation, he would reject every change and growth made by three centuries of Lutheranism and tie us down inflexibly to Luther's German Mass of 1526—which is simply the severest 16th century and individual bondage conceivable. Further, he impales us between two horns of a dilemma: First he says we are to reject the Common Service because it *is* a 16th-century consensus, and second, he says we must reject it because it is *not* a consensus.

Turning aside from this tangle of contradiction, what are the real facts of the case? Simply these: The committee could not have reached any harmonious conclusion at all, had they not some rule of action which all were willing to recognize. This was found in the common *Consensus* of Lutheran liturgies, with a freer action where there was no *Consensus*. They took this rule as their guiding principle. But such improvements as

usage had discerned and here and there added, they incorporated. That is, they acted simply like men of broad judgment and common sense. As the exception confirms the rule, so their lesser inconsistency has proved their larger consistency.

THE SOUTH GERMAN LITURGIES.

For these liturgies, used where the Lutheran Church was fettered in her free development, and her services more or less modeled after the Reformed, Dr. R., as we are by this time prepared to expect, exhibits a strong partiality. He says: "Shall we accept the *Formula Missae*, and the liturgies founded thereon [*i. e.* the liturgies of the distinctively Lutheran type], or shall we accept * * the simple liturgies * * which have been slightly modified in a very few rites and ceremonies by contact with the Reformed, as the true type"? To this question he wishes us to make answer that we prefer the latter. Well, doubtless we would if we were Reformed. But the little circumstance is in the way that we are Lutherans. And love for the good old ways of our fathers, the genius of our ecclesiastical mother, and above all loyalty for our own Church, incline us more to our own denominational rites than to those of other denominations. Dr. R. calls our pure *i. e.* distinctive Lutheran liturgies Romanizing, while those of the Reformed type are evidently to his mind evangelical. Well, if he thinks the Reformed churches are more evangelical in spirit and in worship than the Lutheran, we greatly regret that a Lutheran Professor of Theology should think so. It is a good thing to think your own church's ways better than the ways of other churches. Yea! it is a good thing to be true to your own church. This is, in short, merely the little question of church loyalty. And when the Professor tells us that it is only "a slight modification in a very few rites and ceremonies," we answer, well, if the difference is so very insignificant, why make such an ado and precipitate our whole Church into a great wrangle over it. If, as he tells us, there is "no difference in principle," why not stand by our Lutheran colors? If the more we are like the Reformed, the more evangelical we are, the inevitable logical conclusion is,

that we will only be thoroughly evangelical when we become Reformed altogether.

RATHER OVERDONE.

In Dr. R.'s critique, he applies his dissecting scalpel with a remorseless cruelty to the Common Service. Let us glance at the work he makes of that Consensus or normal type which Kliefeth tells us it "is so easy to make," and which the General Council practically made, and which our three learned committees by "a unanimous agreement" reached in the Common Service. It is asking a good deal of human credulity for us to believe that all these learned men were so totally deluded, and imposed such a "historical misnomer" (*i. e.* glaring ecclesiastical fraud) upon the Church, and to believe that Dr. R.'s single judgment is to make of their work a laughing stock. But let us see to what portions of the Common Service he objects.

1. *The Invocation*, "In the name of the Father," &c. "It begins the Ordinary of the Roman Mass," p. 149. Opposes it.

2. *The Adjutorium*: "Our help is in the name of the Lord." Says of it sarcastically: "Of course it is in Löhe, p. 149. That is, it is Romanizing. Opposes it.

3. *Versicle*. "I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord." "Closely follows the Roman Mass." "Luther angry about it." "The common consent would give a simpler, less complicated form," p. 150. Opposes it.

4. *The Confiteor*, or confession proper. Pages 151, 153, contain a general argument against the whole of it. Opposes it.

5. *Rubrics* for announcing Gospel. Calls these "ritualistic formality," p. 153. Opposed again. Would rather have each minister make his own blundering announcement than confine himself to choice, condensed graceful terms.

6. "*Hallelujah*" at close of reading epistle. "Majority [of liturgies] provide simply a psalm or hymn at this place," p. 154. Observe that before, where the Versicle prescribed only one half a verse from a Psalm (32d), he called it "complicated form." But here a whole Psalm would be "*simply*." Opposed again.

7. Of the *Sentences* at the Gospel, "Glory be to thee, O Lord," and "Praise be to thee, O Christ," he says: "The judgment and

liturgical taste of the fathers of the sixteenth century rejected them with a unanimity which is almost *absolute*," p. 155. Here a sudden reverence for the form-makers of the sixteenth century is discovered, which sends us back to read over the opening dia-tribes of the article concerning bondage to these same persons. Opposed again.

8. "*The Offertory.*" "A stumbling block." "Most unwisely do we restore it to our ecclesiastical vocabulary," p. 157. Bit-terly opposed here.

9. "*The Creed*" (Let us be very thankful for that, as it dates away back to the first centuries and ought to be far more objec-tionable than the sixteenth century products) and the sermon are permitted to stand.

10. "*The Votum.*" (But the first time the preacher's lips open after the sermon in a liturgic form, he misses it again.) "Small authority, indeed, for the Votum after the sermon," p. 158. Opposed again.

11. "*General Prayer.*" "The 'common consent' does not place a general prayer after the sermon," p. 158, note. Oppo-sed again.

12. In the *Communion Service*, of the four principal parts preceding the administration, three are rather opposed. "When the Preface is omitted, as is very generally the case in the South German KOO. [which we are told on page 148 are the true Lu-theran type], the Salutation also is omitted," p. 159. Here fall two parts. "It is no unusual thing also for a rubric to direct the omission of the *exhortation*," p. 159. With these three parts, including so prominent a one as the exhortation, omitted, there would be very little liturgic service left with the Commu-nion. Coming to the close of the Communion, we read "The Versicle is wanting in many liturgies," p. 161, and the "Benedi-camus" and the "Nunc Dimittis" are most decisively rejected. These latter, however, are also omitted in the Common Service as published by the General Synod.

From this review, we ascertain that our destructive critic would do away with fully one half of the Common Service. And when we ask what he will give us in place, we have on page 176 a defiant vindication of the old order, which, although

it violates his own liturgical principles in this very article, by omitting Introit and Collect, Gospel and Epistle, and places the Creed between the Confession and the Gloria in Excelsis (see Richard, p. 158), he yet calls it the "old form of worship," and declares it Lutheran to have it "*on the very same level with the other.*" Setting this forth with her authority was an "assertion of the great law of adaptation." That is, when the General Synod sets forth and authorizes her own proper, historical service, she violates the law of adaptation, is guilty of a transference of effete and tyrannical sixteenth century usages, and manifests a Romanizing tendency, but when she sets forth one whose opening confession is copied from the Book of Common Prayer, and whose order is in utter violation of Lutheran historic usage, then she acts so nobly that he is ready to fly to arms to support her. Now, what is the logical outcome of this violence against a Lutheran and for an un-Lutheran service? Does any one imagine that an order like the one we have been using, constructed not only in disregard of Lutheran but all liturgical usage, can finally prevail in the Lutheran Church? No one knows better than Prof. R. that this is impossible. All then you have to do is to break down the Common Service, and we have none at all left. Are we prepared for this? Is not, then, this attack RATHER OVERDONE?

ARE PRESENT TENDENCIES NON-LITURGICAL?

In full keeping with this non-liturgical animus, on page 179 the views of Farrar are quoted to show that the people at large, and especially "we Lutherans," do not care for a liturgical service. Farrar, with his dangerously loose theology, is hardly an authority to shape the services of the great orthodox Lutheran Church. The signs of the times, besides, indicate quite the contrary. When Congregationalists are introducing extended liturgical forms, and such popular Baptists as MacArthur, and such Presbyterians as Drs. Shields, Hopkins, Parkhurst, Van Dyke and Bartlett are introducing them, and when German and Dutch Reformed have a full liturgical service, and even the Methodists in different cities are becoming liturgical, it is a shame that the Lutheran, which is the first Protestant Church that had a liturgy,

has to lag behind, and copy from others. It is the liturgic churches that are growing, and that are drawing in the cultivated and ruling classes and the masses as well.

It is said, p. 178, that Lutherans have few metropolitan churches. Yes, and they will have fewer still, if we are to model our services after the non-liturgic churches which are already being left behind. Dr. R. says again that our country congregations care but little for these "practices." That is mere pretext. The trouble is not with our "country congregations." It is with some of *our ministers and professors*. While these use their positions and official chairs to misrepresent and assail our historical usages; while they lack all liturgical feelings, and are insensible to the beauty and reverence of decorous and devout worship, they can and do disseminate prejudice and discord.

The charge on page 175 that the Common Service is the "extremest form of liturgy known in the Protestant church" is an inexcusable calumny. Compared with the service of the Book of Common Prayer, it is brief, simple and direct, taking only one fourth of the time. Our churches that have adopted it find it simple, adapted to nature, popular, and positively shorter than the present un-Lutheran one. He who likes less than this would prefer bald Presbyterian barrenness. We have but to say in closing that we cannot but regret, that a Professor who set out with such high promise, should have made the fatal mistake of seeking to discredit the Common Service—of whose intrinsic merit the veteran editor of the *Lutheran Observer* says: "In the number, variety, and devotion of its parts, and in beauty and force of expression, this Order of Worship may justly be regarded as the highest product of the intelligence, piety, culture and taste, guided by the devotional spirit, of the Church of Christ."

Attacks upon such a service will not annihilate it; rather will they annihilate the individual. We believe that God is with our beloved Lutheran Church to-day as of old. And with her Confession as a matter of faith, and her Service as a matter of worship and common bond of uniformity and recognition, the colors under which her loyal legions march, she will go on to victory.

ARTICLE XI.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Luther on Education. Including a Historical Introduction and a Translation of the Reformer's Two Most Important Educational Treatises. By F. V. N. Painter, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages in Roanoke College, and Author of a "History of Education." pp. 282.

This little volume contains ten chapters and an index. The first four chapters are introductory, and discuss respectively "Causes of the Reformation," "The Papacy and Popular Education," "Protestantism and Popular Education," "Education before the Reformation." The next four are entitled, "Luther," "Luther and Domestic Training," "Luther on Schools," "Luther on Studies and Methods." The last two are translations, viz., "Luther to the Mayors and Aldermen of the Cities of Germany in behalf of Christian Schools," "Sermon on the Duty of Sending Children to School."

The subject of this book is one of great interest. The educating world will be glad to know what Luther said and did in the matter of education. Here will be found everything that can be told on the subject, and the reader will be surprised to learn that Luther was not less a Reformer in education than in religion. In this country, through Mr. Bancroft's History of the United States, mainly, people have been accustomed to trace popular education to the Geneva Reformer, but already in the year 1524, when Calvin was only fifteen years old, Luther wrote a letter, which covers forty pages in the book before us, to the mayors and aldermen of the cities of Germany in behalf of Christian schools. He urges them not to neglect the education of the young, as the "right instruction of the youth is a matter in which Christ and all the world are concerned." He maintains that if parents neglect the education of their children the matter should be taken in hand by the city authorities, who cannot excuse themselves for indifference in so great and important an interest. His object is that children, both boys, and girls, should be trained in Christian schools for usefulness as citizens, and as members of the Church. He is also thoroughly practical in his view. He says: "My idea is that boys should spend an hour or two a day in school, and the rest of the time work at home, learn some trade and do whatsoever is desired, so that study and work may go on together, while the children are young and can attend to both." None the less is Luther a pioneer in the matter of establishing public libraries. He says: "No cost or pains should be spared to procure good li-

braries in suitable buildings, especially in large cities, which are able to afford it." His views in reference to the selection of a popular library are so wise and discriminating that we present them in full: "A library should contain the Holy Scriptures in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German and other languages. Then the best and most ancient commentators in Greek, Hebrew and Latin. Secondly, such books as are useful in acquiring languages, as the poets and orators, without considering whether they are heathen or Christian, Greek or Latin. For it is from such works that grammar must be learned. Thirdly, books treating of all arts and sciences. Lastly, books of jurisprudence and medicine, though here discrimination is necessary. A prominent place should be given to chronicles and histories, in whatever languages they may be obtained." In the sermon on the "Duty of Sending Children to School," (1530), which covers sixty pages before us, Luther discusses, first, "The Spiritual Benefit or Injury arising from the Support or Neglect of Schools," and, secondly, "The Temporal Benefit or Injury arising from the Support or the Neglect of Schools." The discussion under both heads is characterized by that penetration, force and practical tact for which Luther is justly celebrated. These two treatises alone, thus presented in an excellent translation, are worth many times the cost of the book, and should be read by all who wish to know what the greatest popular man of the Christian centuries has said on the popular subject of education, both Christian and secular.

We thank Prof. Painter for this book. His own discussions in the first eight chapters are clear, cogent, comprehensive and convincing. The book is a useful and important addition to the literature of education, and ought to have a wide circulation. It will prove an excellent counter-agent to many shallow and conceited methods of purely secular education now in vogue.

J. W. R.

J. H. WEST, BOSTON, MASS.

Evolution. Popular Lectures and Discussions before the Brooklyn Ethical Association.

This is a book to read, if one wishes to know all that is weak and bad in reasoning or in moral and religious tendency in evolution. Believing that there is much truth in the scientific doctrine, we cannot but regret the publication of a volume, which must put it in a damaging light with undiscriminating people.

The book contains a series of essays by different authors read before the Brooklyn Ethical Association. It may be said of the essayists, as of the enemies of Christ, "Many bare witness against him but their witness agreed not together." There is frequent handling of metaphysical and psychological subjects, but the utmost confusion prevails, as for example in the essay on The Evolution of Mind, where the author says in one place (page 182) that "the believer in special creations can

hold to a belief in mind as separate from body, but the evolutionist must accept the doctrine of one persistent reality that subjectively is mind and objectively matter. It is as if two men should quarrel about whether the glass of a bottle all belonged to the outside or inside surface of it. It lies between both but is neither;" but in another place (page 190) "The actual universe without is unknowable. Knowing is the mind's special function, and all we know is in and not out of it" The writer of this seems to have gotten inside his own bottle and forgotten that it has an outside, or that there is glass about him. This occurs in a paragraph of nine closely printed pages, about as long and incoherent as we have often troubled ourselves to read.

Pantheism, Materialism, Agnosticism, *Metanoism*, everything but Christianity (as we understand Christianity) has its advocates in this book. We read repeatedly that the so-called orthodox believers have been the main hindrance in the way of the world's progress. "In the civilization to which we belong, the intellect has been under a ban, and in discredit. The power that declared and has enforced that ban is the so-called Christian Church." (Page 223). The same essayist tells us that "Evolution finds in the teachings of the founder of Christianity, the method by which the 'law and the prophets' are to be fulfilled; and this on evolutionary principles:" and adds further, to our surprise, that "the interests of evolutionary sociology are profoundly concerned in the underlying philosophy as embodied in the words of the Master, which have been handed down to us." (Page 224). "The original record of Christianity" we are told "is in harmony with Evolution." This harmony with a confidence such as one rarely sees in a scriptural exegete, but such as is usual in some scientific circles, the writer sets forth thus: "According to the evidence we have, the historical Christ, when dealing with the 'kingdom of heaven' which he said was at hand, employs a single word as embodying the necessary condition. The custodians of the record have concealed this fact, by falsely translating the word so used, making it to read, 'repent.' The word so translated is, in the original, *metanoeo*. It relates, in reality, to mind and knowledge, and to that exercise of the mind and to that knowledge which are *beyond* (*meta*),—beyond mere sense perception and all concerns of life, society, and whatever relates thereto. In their days of decline, the Greeks of Athens erected an altar to the 'agnostic god.' Paul, seeing that altar, preached to them a sermon, in which he sought to check their superstition by presenting to them his Meta-gnostic God as the Christian substitute for their Agnostic deity. In the preaching and teaching of Christ himself, meta-gnosticism is everywhere associated with the coming of the kingdom of heaven."

All this is curious enough. But we confess we were more surprised elsewhere. We infer from its title that the association, before which these papers were read, has an ethical purpose. In the field of ethics

therefore we expected something that would reward the perusal of the book. We quite gave up hope after reading the following: "I must call your attention to the fact that the human structure is not made for an upright being at all; it is made for a quadruped. If a human being had made man as he is, we should have said that he did not know what he was about. The diseases from which the fair sex suffer are to a considerable extent due to the fact that the organs of the pelvis were intended for a being walking on four feet. We have not yet adapted ourselves to the upright position." (Page 174). It is quite in accord with this that (page 258) we are told, "Heretofore the ethical systems of the world have in the main rested upon man's thought of God. It has been assumed that man's supreme obligations were due to God. The new philosophy affirms that man's primary obligations are to his fellowman, that duty grows out of the necessities of social communion. In collecting and collating its facts, it studies man as he exists to-day and as he has existed throughout the entire period of his evolution. It prolongs its vision into prehistoric times by use of the scientific imagination. It forms a vivid conception of man as he was gradually outgrowing the inheritance of his brute ancestry and progressing towards civilization." This substitution in the new philosophy of the thought of a brute ancestry for the thought of God may account for such practical teaching as this, (page 271): "In many of the situations of life, the best that the conscientious individual can do is to choose that course of conduct which seems to be productive of the fewest evil results, instead of that which is absolutely right." We submit that there are already so many in the world of that way of thinking that no Ethical Society need be formed to increase their number.

The book is climactic in a certain respect. It begins with biographical essays on Spencer and Darwin in which these, as prophets of the new philosophy, are lauded to the skies. It ends in a quarrel with Darwin. "Darwin explicitly places an intelligent Creator at the beginning of the process of organic evolution. I put in a demurrrer here. The God who impresses laws on matter is a very near relation to the God who originates species by special creation and performs the various miracles of the New Testament. He is the same sort of God. And if his appearance in the closing scene of Darwin's drama of existence has due warrant, then Darwin did no more for us than to establish the probability of natural selection within certain empirical limits. It were a lame and impotent conclusion. My criticism and my condemnation are not for the real Darwin; they are for the Darwin of a few ill-considered phrases at the close of his book." (Page 324).

We cannot but feel a pity, though they themselves resent it, for those who cannot abide even the God of Darwin.

J. K. D.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Dr. Muhlenberg. By William Wilberforce Newton, D. D. pp. 272.
Price \$1.25.

Dr. William Augustus Muhlenberg was the elder son of Henry William Muhlenberg who was the eldest son of Frederick A. Muhlenberg, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the first Congress, and second son of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg the Patriarch of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.

Dr. Muhlenberg had an appreciative biographer shortly after his death (1877) in Miss Anne Ayers. His work has a most competent expounder in Dr. Newton, who, after a brief sketch of Dr. Muhlenberg's life, treats his readers to well written chapters on "The Development of the School Idea in American Church Life," "The Type of Churchmanship of which Muhlenberg was the Creator," "The History of the Memorial Movement," "The Growth of Institutionalism through the Genius of his personality," "The After-glow of his Influence." The biographical sketch teaches Lutherans a useful lesson in these words: "His mother was of the Lutheran faith; but as the children were ignorant of the German language, in which the Lutheran services were conducted, they were left to their own choice of a church for Sunday worship, and that of William and his sister fell upon Christ Church, of which Bishop White was rector." This explains why it is that this distinguished man was lost to the faith of his illustrious ancestors; it also explains why it is that thousands of Lutheran children are annually lost to the Church of their fathers.

Dr. Muhlenberg was born in Philadelphia in 1796, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1815, became deacon and assistant to Bishop White in 1817, was advanced to the priesthood in 1820, settled shortly afterwards as rector at Lancaster, Pa., where he remained five and a half years, and was thenceforward engaged in the work of education at Flushing, L. I., until 1844. He is justly regarded as the father of the diocesan school system of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. He also founded the "Free Church of the Holy Communion" in New York, St. Luke's Hospital, and St. Johnland as a home for crippled children. His whole life was devoted to philanthropic pursuits. As pastor, teacher, founder of eleemosynary institutions, he was unwearyed in making the fullest and broadest applications of Christianity to suffering humanity. His ecclesiastical position may be known from his own designation of himself, "an evangelical catholic." He loved and fellowshiped with all whom he believed to be Christians, and ardently sought to bring about a closer union between the followers of Christ. His view of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States as given by Dr. Newton is not very high: "Her worship was not

catholic in point of proscription; her system was sectarian in point of prescription. She made stalwart claims to historic catholicity, but this was not the style of catholicity which Dr. Muhlenberg held aloft as his ideal." These brief notes will give a fair idea of the busy life and the broad Christian character of Dr. Muhlenberg. He was regarded as a dreamer nearly all his life, but nearly all his dreams were realized, and now form no small part of the measures and activities of his denomination, of which he came to be "the truest leader." The book is an important addition to the "American Religious Leaders" series, and deserves to be widely read not only because of the noble work which it records, but also because of the light it throws on the inner working and history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America during the second and third decades of this century.

J. W. R.

Memoirs of a Millionaire. By Lucia True Ames.

This is a noticeable book, not so much for itself as for what it suggests respecting some literary tendencies of our age. The author of Robert Elsmere has done nothing else so bad, as to stir up a host of imitators. The book before us is written by a woman. It need have been none the worse for that. Women have shown of late splendid ability in book-writing. It is titled "Memoirs." It has something to say on all the topics of the time, from the best arrangement of clothes-poles on the roofs of tenement houses to the Hegelian philosophy. It contains elaborate plans of house building, at the same time the history of an experimental conflict in religion. Of course where so many things are said something now and then must be said that is good. The book is in the form of a novel, and has a chapter or two of love-making. One evening "before the wood-fire, watching the flames dance and flicker and cast weird shadows on the wall," Mildred tells her companion how she was once in love. She met her lover on the way to the Concord School of Philosophy. After listening to a discourse on Immortality, she and he sit down under a tree and "eat sandwiches and bananas." During this time her "broad-shouldered" lover, his "by no means classic features having a wonderful charm," his "great blue eyes lighted up," relates his religious doubts. From the cradle he had been destined to missionary work. "Night after night," says he, "have I walked my floor until morning. I have no message to give others for I am sure of nothing. I shall be more than thankful if in twenty years I have mastered this book." And he drew a volume of Hegel from his pocket. Readers of Robert Elsmere will remember the beautiful chapter in which Robert helps Catherine over the stepping-stones at the ford. The story before us is in a different style. "The sun was sinking behind the trees as we rose to go homeward. *Stiffened with sitting so long I tripped and fell.* He sprang and caught me in his great, strong arms for one little moment then—well—I trembled a bit."

The lovers see no more of each other for a year or more. Ralph Everett (even the initials R. E. are suggestive) goes West. Before meeting Mildred he was engaged to one Agnes. Agnes is a Catherine. But Ralph Everett is shrewder than was Robert Elsmere. He discovers her bent before marriage. "Do you know how unjust and bitter a woman can be when she thinks that she alone is entrusted with the decrees of the Almighty?" Ralph reflected to purpose. He broke the engagement. Agnes subsequently married a missionary to India; which, says the novelist, was the correct thing for her to do. In course of time Mildred was traveling by rail in the West. The car, in which she was, was thrown from the track and took fire, she under it. Ralph, who of all men in the West happened to be there (Rider Haggard could not have done that better), not knowing that it was she, saved her from destruction. The rescue is described with a newspaper coarseness, quite preparing us for what follows. She having been shocked, bruised and burned, and he having a hemorrhage from over-exertion, they are placed on couches side by side, while they are both expecting to die. On Mildred's own suggestion they agree to be married then and there. Nevertheless when the clergyman, found with difficulty and brought from far, opens the prayer-book for the ceremony, Mildred protests. Her self-respect as a woman will be violated should she vow, as the Episcopal Service requires, that she will obey a man. Tolstoi has been criticised as forgetful of his realistic principles, when he tells us the thoughts of a dying man. The thoughts of which he tells are however such as we can believe a dying man might have had. The scene before us requires a Boston imagination. Contrary to all expectation Mildred and Ralph recover. The book closes, like that which inspired it, with the establishment of schools in which humanity is to be redeemed by "story-telling."

There are decided objections to the treatment of theological subjects in novels. A good novel, as a distinguished man has said, cannot be so heavily freighted, nor can such subjects be treated always with fairness within the limitations a good novel imposes. Anything can be put into the mouth of a fictitious character, however contrary to reason or to fact. But the story in the present book is the poorest part of it. J. K. D.

The Lily among Thorns. A Study of the Biblical Drama Entitled, The Song of Songs. By William Elliot Griffis, D. D.

This book shows acquaintance with the best recent Biblical criticism. Much conscientious labor has been bestowed upon it. It is almost a *Thesaurus on the Song of Songs*. It treats of the life and times of King Solomon, the history of the book itself, its dramatic structure; gives the text of the Revised Version and then a series of studies and comments. The author takes the view now generally received, that the book is not an allegory but a drama, representing a maiden, having at

once a royal suitor, who is King Solomon in all his glory, and also a very humble suitor, who is some obscure shepherd. She resists all Solomon's strong importunities, and "in the name of God and Love" stands to the end faithful to her shepherd. The book is shown to teach the highest lessons of simplicity, constancy and virtue. We think it was the historian Niebuhr who on being asked why such a book as the Song of Songs should be in the Bible answered, "Love is man's deepest passion. It were strange if the Bible had nothing to say about it." Dr. Griffis seems to be of the same opinion. Perhaps he is over strong in some of his statements; he is more sure that Solomon did not write the book than some good authorities are: we can hardly go with him either with ranking Solomon with the worst characters of the Old Testament, though we do think Solomon bad enough: nor can we agree that the Song of Songs is "the completion, the crowning work of inspired Hebrew wisdom." We may say also, that Dr. Griffis so repeatedly and vehemently insists on the purity of the book that he is in danger of making some begin to suspect it. In his endeavor to arrange it in a dramatic form, he seems rather more successful than others have been; still he himself would not expect us always to follow him without doubts. We are to know the different speakers by certain marks, the words they employ, the figures of speech, as courtly or sylvan, etc. This reminds us of Pentateuchal division; we are to know the documents by the marks, the critic himself at his study-table first determining what the marks shall be. But on the whole Dr. Griffis' book is excellent, interesting, instructive, scholarly, original in some respects and very wholesome.

J. K. D.

Life of Harriet Beecher Stowe. Compiled from Her Letters and Journals. By Her Son, Charles Edward Stowe. pp. 530.

Harriet Beecher Stowe would stand out as a unique character and deserve high praise as a writer, apart from her relation to the abolition of slavery; but it is the efficient services rendered to the millions in bondage that has made her name familiar in almost every household. The blow given to slavery by her "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was so effective that the institution never recovered from it, and its influence in creating sentiment and stimulating the abolitionists to more persistent effort can not be over-estimated. The story of her relation to the book is intensely interesting in itself. According to her own confession the book almost wrote itself, and few were more surprised at the effect produced by it than she herself.

But it is all through her life that we get more than glimpses of a most remarkable woman—an honor to her sex and her country. In her religious views she was much more in sympathy with her brother, Henry Ward Beecher, than with her more learned father, and not infer-

ior to either in intellectual acuteness. Her country can well be satisfied to have only one such woman in a generation.

This book is compiled, as the title-page states, from her letters and journals, and gives the reader free access to the events of her whole life—childhood, girlhood, family life with all its vexations as well as joys, the experiences and observations of her European trips, as a writer of books and for periodicals, her correspondence and association with persons of rank and position in Europe and America—indeed, everything is laid bare. When once begun, the book will hold the reader to the end. The enterprising firm that has published it has given us a handsome volume.

A New England Girlhood. Outlined from Memory. By Lucy Larcom. pp. 274.

This is an autobiography that portrays the best type of the New England girl in her struggles with poverty and her efforts at womanly independence. Unusually gifted by nature, she gives frequent manifestations of her mental powers which afterwards fruited to the delight of many readers. In the details given of family, school and church life, we have many glimpses of the ways and manners of rural New England from about 1830 to 1840, and of a factory town for some years after the latter date. It is full of interest and healthfully stimulating to the reader in quickening his energy in life's struggles and in giving lofty Christian purposes.

D. APPLETON AND CO., NEW YORK.

Introduction to the Study of Philosophy. By William T. Harris. Comprising Passages from his Writings, selected and arranged with Commentary and Illustrations by Marietta Kies. Presented as a Thesis in connection with the work for the Master's Degree at the University of Michigan. pp. 287. 1889.

We have an altogether unique work in this volume by Miss Kies. It is a well executed effort to form a text-book by selection and arrangement of passages from the various writings of Dr. Harris the well-known editor of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. The task of bringing together in this way the widely scattered materials was suggested and undertaken by Miss Kies in connection with her class-room instructions in philosophy in Mount Holyoke Seminary and College. The task was a difficult one, but her purpose has been very creditably accomplished, presenting in fairly systematized order the general philosophical teaching of Dr. Harris.

According to this teaching the starting point in philosophy is found in the three great ideas of space, time and cause, as the presuppositions of experience. The last of these, as the deepest principles, leads up through the simple relation of fixed cause and effect to self-activity, both relative and absolute. Absolute self-activity, called *causa sui* is

the infinite form of causality. This is, *par excellence*, the principle of philosophy. "Self-cause, or eternal energy, is the ultimate presupposition of all things and events. Here is the necessary ground of the idea of God." Self-activity, being in intelligence and freedom, inexorably demands that the absolute being be conceived of as a Person. "Natural science does not find itself able to avoid thinking self-activity as the ground of things and forces. A logical investigation of the principle of persistent force would prove that the principle of Personal Being is pre-supposed as its true form. Since the persistent force is the sole and ultimate reality, it originates all other reality only by self-activity, and thus is self-determined. Self-determination implies self-consciousness as the true form of existence." While simple sense-perception may be atheistic, and the simple understanding pantheistic, the *reason* is theistic, because it finds self-activity or self-determination and identifies these with Absolute Personality. Both atheism and pantheism present only fragmentary and an irrational view of the aggregate facts of the universe. Dr. Harris is on rock-bed foundations in this exclusion of both atheism and pantheism from valid philosophical standing.

Despite this clear theism, Dr. Harris has used, and Miss Kies has included, statements as on p. 26 that have not been rightly guarded from alliance with Hegelian pantheistic misconception. And by an altogether unnecessary framing of his philosophy into harmony with the scientific hypothesis of evolution, he departs from the Biblical conception of primitive man and rests his personal immortality on reaching a specific stage in genetic evolution. This evolution is a "means used by an absolute personal being, God, for the creation of living souls in his own image." "When the animal progresses beyond recollection and fancy to generalization, he becomes immortal as an individual." There is not a particle of proof that the animal intelligence ever passes the dividing line thus indicated; or that if it did the progress gives individual immortality. Scarcely anything could be more unsatisfactory, also, than the author's offered philosophy—often attempted on the same line before—of the trinitarian distinctions on the Absolute Being.

The aggregate plan and discussion of the volume include beyond these leading views, an outline presentation of psychological, logical, and ethical principles, adjusted into harmony with the fundamental conceptions in the system.

The features to which we have taken exception, though they impair do not destroy the value of the book. It is a desirable compendium of the philosophical views of Dr. Harris. And the main philosophical principles laid down are so well grounded and so clearly presented that it must prove a valuable help to the discriminating student. It abounds in strong and stimulating thought.

M. V.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

The Unknown God, or Inspiration among Pre-Christian Races. By C. Loring Brace, author of "Gesta Christi," "Races of the Old World," etc. 1890. pp. 336.

Mr. Brace's work is a study in the department of Comparative Religion. He follows the method now dominant among writers on this subject, of searching for the good discoverable in the ethnic or heathen religions and emphasizing, not the features of inferiority to Christianity, but of likeness to it. He has sought, in general, to trace how men, apart from Christianity, looked upon the cause and nature of the universe, the mysteries of life, the questions of God and duty and destiny. In particular the aim of the book has been to investigate the question of a universal *inspiration* of the Divine Spirit among men, and to note what seem to be evidences of such divine teaching in the remotest annals and records of the race. The discussion is unified about the inscription: "To the Unknown God," which St. Paul quoted on Mars Hill, and in connection with which he added: "Whom ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." Naturally and fairly Mr. Brace finds in this ignorant worship a real approach, in greater and smaller measure, to the true "God that made the worlds and all things therein, Lord of heaven and earth, in whom we live and move." And he seeks further and especially to discover, along with the identification of the object of worship thus 'felt after' and 'haply found,' evidences of a divine teaching of the heathen nations through an inspiration which, though inferior in degree, was of the same kind with that vouchsafed to and through the Jewish people.

With this in view, Mr. Brace has made a most interesting and valuable collection of passages from the religious writings and records of the principal and oldest nations of the world. The large and inestimable results of recent exploration and investigation have been freely used, and brought together in relations and forms admirably adapted to exhibit the author's sense of their import and bearing. He begins with Egypt, tracing from manifold records, the clear proofs there of a thoroughly monotheistic religion, with recognition of man's immortality, a future state of rewards and punishments, inculcating at the same time many of the clearest and finest ethical principles. Then, after a statement of relations between the Jewish and early Egyptian teaching, the wonderful conceptions in the Akkadian psalms are brought to view, followed by a portrayal of the deeper truths taught yet concealed under the Greek "Mysteries," and "Zeus as a spiritual God." The faith of the Stoics is delineated in the most elevated representations found in classic literature. The same course is pursued with the Zoroastrian Hindu and Buddhistic religions. The three concluding chapters review the import of the ethnic literature thus presented, and discuss the ques-

tion of Biblical recognition of such inspiration as the author believes he has found in this literature, together with the bearing of all the facts on missionary effort and methods.

Mr. Brace has wrought out this whole study with ability and skill, under evidently warm interest in the subject and the conclusions he has reached. It is adorned with the graces of pure and glowing style. It is certainly a happy fact that out of these ethnic religions may be collected so many gems of clear, rich theistic, and ethical thought and so many precepts and sentiments of piety, all aglow with a light that might make them worthy of a place in the Christian revelation. And it is an attractive conclusion that would see in them evidences that God did not let the nations which have been outside of Christianity "without witness of Himself" or divine illumination. But we cannot but feel that he presses his inferences to conclusions far beyond what the facts warrant. Though he carefully guards against following the extreme of some who think these ethnic religions only slightly inferior to Christianity, and asserts for these an unapproached pre-eminence, yet he traces what he finds to a universal inspiration. "The Hebrews showed this inspiration more than any other people," but the difference is a difference of degree. "The Akkadian races seem to have been touched with the same inspirations which reached the Hebrews as to a righteous God and sins against his will and law."

However attractive and instructive in many respects the author's presentation may be, we must regard it as unsafe and misleading. For, it must be remembered, as Mr. Brace confesses, that these gems of religious conception and morality, are in fact only the choice findings culled from masses of absurdity, myth and fable. And when we scan and analyze them, they contain nothing whatever beyond what belongs to simply *natural religion*—the product of the natural intentions and reasonings of the human mind and the action of conscience, under the impulse of the religious nature, in the presence of the phenomena of the world and the experiences of life. Mr. Brace exalts to the rank of "inspiration" what belongs to the natural powers of the human soul in contact with the realities of experience. And the viciousness of the general procedure appears in the fact that he starts out with a private and spurious view of inspiration, not as being a divine communication from God, but simply human discovery of him and of ethical truth, and looking upon the Hebrew seers as reaching the spiritual verities they disclosed by merely subjective intuition and naturalistic insight. Instead of keeping the question of inspiration open for decision from the total facts in the case, it virtually assumes the conclusion at the beginning by a view of inspiration which leveled away the distinction between real revelation and man's findings. Logically, such a procedure as this must ignore, or at least obscure all the special unique redemptive content of the Old Testament, shaping all that preparatory movement and coming into ful-

ness of redemptive action in the New Testament, and sacrificed all that pre-eminently distinguishes and constitutes Christianity. In the Bible inspiration are given not simply a few detached sublime theistic, religious and ethical truths, but a movement of redeeming action with a perspective from the Garden of Eden to the new earth and new heavens.

"Our little systems have their day ;
They have their day and cease to be,
They are but broken lights of Thee,"

may be applicable to the ethnic religions, born of this so-called inspiration, but not to the word of the Lord in which holy men have spoken as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. While it is cheering to be shown more and more light as attained by the races outside of Christianity, this minimizing the conception of inspiration tends at once to an overestimate of the heathen religions and confusion as to the essence of Christianity.

M. V.

The Sermon Bible. Isaiah to Malachi. pp. 511. \$1.50.

This is the fourth volume of this series and completes the Old Testament. There will be eight volumes on the New Testament, this difference being due to the fact that more sermons are preached on texts from the N. T. than from the Old. In notices of former volumes we have given the method of preparing the books—to compile from the best homiletical literature, and give outlines, more or less full, of sermons by eminent preachers and references to theological treatises, etc. As we have stated in a former notice, not the least valuable feature is the references to sermons on the respective texts. We have our serious misgivings both as to the propriety and value of using the "helps" found in our homiletical books and magazines, but such extracts and outlines as are found in the "Sermon Bible" seem especially useful by way of suggestion and in stimulating thought.

The Salt-Cellars. Being a collection of Proverbs, together with Homely Notes thereon. By C. H. Spurgeon. pp. 367.

In our January issue we noticed the first of the two volumes bearing the above title; and our commendation of that applies also to this. The proverbs are arranged in alphabetical order, the first volume covering A to L inclusive and the second M to Z.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

History of the United States of America during the Second Administration of Thomas Jefferson. By Henry Adams. 2 Vols. pp. 471, 500. \$4.00.

The two volumes of this work covering the first administration of Jefferson were noticed in our last issue. The promptness of the pub-

VOL. XX. No. 2.

49

lishers in bringing out the volumes treating of the second administration, has placed readers under great obligation, for the story, told in the best literary style, is one of profound historical interest, and every page, as in the case of a romance, excites a passionate eagerness for what is to follow. One of the most eminent literary authorities has pronounced these volumes "a distinct addition to American literature," and has declared that no student of American history can neglect them without irreparable loss.

The author is evidently possessed of the cardinal attributes of historical writing, perfect familiarity with all the sources of information, whether American, English, Spanish or French, and a calm, judicial analytical exhibition of the character of the leading figures upon the stage. It seems a pity to shatter such American idols as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, yet the American passion for hero-worship needs occasionally a little cooling off. The history of Burr's conspiracy, as here portrayed, makes an astounding revelation, which no American can read without unutterable shame. To see a reckless traitor openly scheming for the destruction of his country, having for his accomplices, with varying shades of guilt, Senators and Congressmen, Andrew Jackson and the General-in-chief of the Army, with the ostensible connivance, for months, of the President himself, and with the suspected and successful purpose of Chief Justice Marshall to shield and acquit the arch-conspirator, makes a dark and ignoble chapter from which one turns with disgust over the weakness of great men and the detestable conduct of politicians.

How the country was held together during this period of faction and faithlessness at home, while it was at the same time involved in the most serious European complications, can not be accounted for except by the devout faith that a divinity presides over nations. One may not conclude from the character and consequences of Jefferson's administration that his philosophy made him an ideal President, or that it enabled him to cope with partisan scheming and to achieve victories in diplomacy, but the soundness of his political maxims will hardly be doubted. And ideas are after all greater than men. The advice given to his grandson near the close of his second term, offers a lesson of imperishable wisdom to men who aspire to exert influence in the state or the church. "Be a listener only," he said: "keep within yourself, and endeavor to establish with yourself the habit of silence, especially on politics. In the fevered state of our country no good can ever result from any attempt to set one of these fiery zealots to rights, either in fact or principle. They are determined as to the facts they will believe, and the opinions on which they will act. Get by them, therefore, as you would by an angry bull; it is not for a man of sense to dispute the road with such an animal."

Among Cannibals. An Account of Four Years' Travels in Australia and of Camp Life with the Aborigines of Queensland. By Carl Lumholtz, M. A., Member of the Royal Society of Sciences of Norway. Translated by Rasmus B. Anderson, ex-United States Minister to Denmark. pp. 395.

Prof. Lumholtz states in his preface that in 1880 he "undertook an expedition to Australia, partly at the expense of the University of Christiana, with the object of making collections for the zoological and zootomical museums of the university, and of instituting researches into the customs and anthropology of the little-known native tribes which inhabit that continent."

After spending a short time in the south-eastern colonies (South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales) and establishing connections with the museums in the cities of Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney, he spent ten months in Central Queensland. In August, 1881, he entered upon his first journey of discovery, penetrating about 800 miles into Western Queensland. He then went to Northern Queensland where he spent fourteen months in constant travel and study.

Without depreciating the results of his investigations in the line of zoology and comparative anatomy, the greater interest to the general reader will be in the descriptions of the life, manners and customs of the Australian aborigines. The author is a good observer and we here have a faithful picture of the character, mode of life, etc., of perhaps the lowest type of the human race. It is a valuable contribution to the science of ethnography.

The book has excellent maps, and is illustrated with four chromolithographs and many first-class wood-cuts. The illustrations are by Norwegian and French artists from original photographs, sketches and specimens brought by the author from Australia. The Appendix, which gives an outline of the History of Australia, its Geography, Flora and Fauna, is an important feature. The fine, heavy paper and the superior letter-press are in keeping with the interesting and valuable contents of this handsome volume.

CHARLES L. WEBSTER AND CO., 3 EAST 14TH ST. NEW YORK.

A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court. By Mark Twain. pp. 575.

The plan of this book was suggested by a visit of the author to Warwick Castle and his meeting with a guide there, who, he says attracted him by three things: "His candid simplicity, his marvelous familiarity with ancient armor, and the restfulness of his company,—for he did all the talking." * * As he talked along, softly, pleasantly, flowingly, he seemed to drift away imperceptibly out of this world and time, and into some remote era and old forgotten country; and so he gradually wove such a spell about me that I seemed to move among the spectres and

shadows and dust and mold of a gray antiquity, holding speech with a relic of it."

Acting on this impression, he takes a matter-of-fact, hard-headed Connecticut mechanic and machinist and transposes him to England and back thirteen hundred years to the sixth century, "alive and in the flesh in King Arthur's court among the iron-clad Knights of the Round Table." He is there ten years; uses his scientific and mechanical knowledge to the surprise and wonder of all; easily supplants the enchanter, Merlin; and becomes the wisest and most noted personage in the kingdom. His knowledge of the time of an eclipse of the sun gives him the opportunity of making the people believe that he has the power to blot the sun out of existence, and he uses his knowledge of gunpowder and lightning rods to confirm the belief in his magical powers. He constantly surprises them with the common things of the nineteenth century and becomes the wonder of the sixth.

In the position of power to which he was advanced by the king, he sets himself to the task of turning the monarchy into a republic on the American plan and makes some happy hits at English criticism of America. Coming from Mark Twain, it cannot help being characterized by ludicrous adventures and an entertaining way of saying things. Exception may be taken to the American slang, but even this is enjoyable on account of the surprise it causes to his hearers. It is sold by subscription, and college students, who wish to canvass during vacation, are requested to correspond with the publishers. It is an attractive book and ought to meet with a ready sale.

THOMAS WHITAKER, 2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

Outlines of Christian Doctrine. By the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M. A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. pp. 266.

The small size of this work is no measure of its worth. Written by a scholarly clergyman of the Church of England, it, of course, represents the essential features of its theological and ecclesiastical system. But it represents them in their best type. The treatise was first planned as a commentary upon the Thirty-Nine Articles. As the work proceeded the author modified the plan so as, while keeping the Confession in mind, to embrace the main doctrines of the Christian faith in more proportionate and systematic view. He has not aimed at originality or fullness, but to guide and stimulate personal thought and study by intelligent believers.

Rarely have we met a book better adapted to its proposed aim. With a mind evidently well-trained in speculative thought, critically familiar with the history of theology and the differing and distinctive views which have appeared in its development and mark its present state, he has

written "outlines" that are acute, richly suggestive and stimulating. He moves along lines which avoid both High Church and Broad Church extremes and conservatively maintain the living orthodoxy of the purest Anglican theology. On the doctrine of election, he is moderately and cautiously Calvinistic, laying great emphasis on the divine love. On the nature of the sacraments stress is put upon the covenant-sealing function, assuring the grace which they represent—not empty signs but gracious divine action. Baptism is "the solemn sealing of a covenant, whose internal realities rise above limits of date and season." From the Lord's Supper "the disciple goes forth fed and refreshed with Jesus Christ, who has thus solemnly made over to him anew his sacrificed body and outpoured blood; that is, his finished Sacrifice, bearing its 'innumerable benefits.'" In the doctrine of the Church, the author makes the fundamental distinction between the Church as invisible and as visible, and maintains its primary unity to be in the real invisible union of believers in Christ, while a secondary unity belongs to the visible communion. "The worst and deepest *schism* after all is that which slights the holy bond" of oneness of all believers in Christ. He asserts that though all the great leaders of the English Reformation set high and reverent value on episcopal Church order as a principle, episcopal government was certainly not made a 'note' by the leading Anglicans of the xvii century." The peculiar episcopal order is therefore not made *essential*; and an Episcopalian, while sincerely desiring a temperate uniformity of church order, may "heartily recognize and honor the church position of his Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist, or Methodist brethren."

Without accepting all the views presented by Principal Moule, we cannot forbear to say this unpretentious work so happily combines conservative theology with sound advancing knowledge, is so packed with great truths from the whole field of Christian teaching, and so affluent in quickening suggestion, as to deserve a wide circulation. M. V.

The Language of the New Testament. By the late Rev. W. H. Simcox, M. A. 16mo. pp. 226. 75 cts.

This is one of the volumes of "The Theological Educator" series, edited in Great Britain. It does not profess to be a complete grammar of New Testament Greek, but to indicate representatively points of difference between its usages and those of classical Greek. It also attempts to distinguish the linguistic features of each of the N. T. writers as respects Hellenistic Greek and one another. The author traces the Greek language after Alexander's time, and has a chapter in general on the language of the Jewish Hellenists. Then he deals with particular characteristics in the forms and syntactical use of the various parts of speech, with a chapter on miscellaneous features of N. T. Greek. There is a full Index of texts cited. The whole is intended as a more

than ordinarily juicy introduction to a dry subject, sufficient at least to give the reader "a just notion of the amount of deference due to grammatical specialists." The author takes "a large view of the liberty of the non-grammarian" and looks "for little gain to theology, and hardly any to devotion, from the minute verbal study of the language of the New Testament."

The work of a careful reader of the Scriptures, who is also acquainted with the Greek language, is given in this volume in a compact, well-printed, convenient form.

H. L. B.

FLEMING H. REVEL, 148 MADISON ST., CHICAGO.

Studies in the Book. First Series Containing Studies on the New Testament Historical Books, the General Epistles and the Apocalypse. By Revere Franklin Weidner, Professor and Doctor of Theology. pp. 122.

A remarkable amount of material is crowded here in small space. Besides the studies on the books of the New Testament indicated on the title page, it contains outlines on the genuineness of the N. T. books and their correct transmission; on the inspiration, geography and chronology of the N. T.; on the harmony of the Gospels; on the doctrine and work of the Holy Spirit; on the doctrines of Regeneration, Justification, Sanctification, and others of prime importance. A feature of special importance is the proof-texts given to sustain and elucidate every point in those outlines that are based upon scriptural argument.

This series of Bible studies was conducted by Dr. Weidner during the last Christmas holidays in Moody's Biblical Institute, Chicago. They met with such gratifying acceptance, that it was thought well to put them in book form for wider diffusion. They are specially well adapted for Bible classes, Societies of Christian Endeavor, and Y. M. C. Associations. Bible students everywhere will find this little book helpful in systematic study, and we commend it to them. The interleaving with writing paper is an excellent idea, and will be found convenient for those who wish to give more detail to the outlines or add other proof-texts.

LUTHERISCHER CONCORDIA-VERLAG, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Unterscheidungslehren der hauptsächlichsten sich lutherisch nennenden Synoden so wie der nahmhaftesten Sektenkirchen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika. Zusammengestellt im Auftrag der ev.-luth. Nord-Illinois Pastoralconferenz von T. Johannes Grosse, evang.-lutherischer Pastor in Addison, Ill. pp. 132.

A work of this character in a brief compass is a desirable addition to our ecclesiastical literature. But its first merits must be fairness and accuracy of statement. Without these such a book has no value. And the lack of these, we are sorry to say, is very conspicuous on these

pages. Of the General Synod, for instance, it is asserted: "Of Lutheranism it has adopted nothing beyond the name 'Evangelical Lutheran.' By its own confession it is and wants to be a *Union (Unirte) Synod!*" Then the famous letter of 1845 which was sent to Germany, a letter which the General Synod never saw and therefore never could have endorsed, is called in by way of proving this indictment.

To show that the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism receive only conditional recognition, the old form of subscription rejected more than twenty-five years ago is cited, while the present form of subscription is not given. Then the Definite Platform is quoted to show that certain articles of the Augustana were formally repudiated, but it fails to say that the General Synod never had anything to do with the Definite Platform and that its appearance brought reproach upon its authors, from which they never recovered. It is clear from the citations noted in this little volume, that Pastor Grosse's reading so far as it concerned the General Synod, embraced nothing published within the last twenty-five years. Therefore even if his strictures had been just at that time, they are groundless to-day. Furthermore, while the General Synod has undoubtedly tolerated men whose acceptance of distinctive Lutheran features was limited to the name, it has never officially discountenanced or repudiated Lutheran doctrine or Lutheran principles. Even the admission of the Franckeans was rendered possible only by the assurance of its delegates that the body believed that its adoption of the General Synod's constitution involved the adoption of the Augsburg Confession. An official body can be rightly judged only by its official action—and though the General Synod may never have condemned laxity that is incompatible with Lutheranism, it has happily never allowed itself to be compromised by giving official sanction to the renunciation of anything confessionally or historically Lutheran.

DE WOLFE, FISKE AND CO., 365 WASHINGTON ST., BOSTON.

Lake Champlain and Its Stories. By W. H. H. Murray, author of "Adventures in the Wilderness," "Daylight Land," "Adirondack Tales," "Mamelons," "Ungava," etc. pp. 261.

The author had the intention of writing a full history of Lake Champlain and the interesting events that have occurred along its shores, and had been collecting material for it, but, fearing that such a work would not meet with a ready sale "under the present condition of the public taste in respect to letters, * * when mental efforts are weighed in the same scale with sugar and ham," he decided to give only a brief account which he wishes to be "regarded by the reader as a suggestion rather than a treatment of the subject."

The historical section will not fail to quicken a desire to know more than we now know of the struggles and exploits, before the Revolution,

which contributed so much towards bringing that protracted war to a successful issue. Mr. Murray claims that we have nothing reliable, notwithstanding the length of time that has elapsed. "Is it not a most strange thing," he asks, "that although nearly three centuries have passed since the curtain was lifted and the first act of a drama to which a hemisphere supplied the audience and in whose successive schemes the most ambitious kings, astute diplomats, famous generals, the greatest financiers, and the most dauntless spirits of Europe and England were the actors, was played, there is not, with the exception of Mr. Parkman's little silhouette of the subject—a single page of accurate history written?" (pp. 58, 59).

He regards the beginning of the struggle for independence to have occurred not with "the feeble skirmish at Lexington, or the fierce disorderly fight on Bunker Hill," but on Lake Champlain, where was learned the use of military weapons and the value of discipline, and the martial spirit was nurtured by the warlike culture received "under the most skillful and bravest generals of fighting England."

We are quite sure that the reader of this book will not only be entertained by the fresh and lively way of putting things, so characteristic of Mr. Murray's writings, but will also be impressed with the importance of having a fuller and more accurate history of what occurred in pre-revolutionary times in the valley of Champlain. After this book is once widely read, the author can go on with his more complete history, and his publisher can print it without a doubt as to a larger pecuniary return. This will only whet the appetite and, like Oliver Twist, the reading public will ask for "more."